Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. IX JULY, 1938 No. 7

A Course in Lutheran Theology

(Continued)

We have not exhausted the subject of *sola gratia* as treated by Luther in *De Servo Arbitrio*. There is the all-important matter of the sinner's justification before God. And the *sola gratia* is the heart of the doctrine of justification. That is the blessed truth which comforts the heart of the despairing sinner. That is the glorious truth which the minister of the Gospel needs to study and restudy, to study every day of his life.

And that truth was denied by Erasmus. He denied not only that conversion is altogether the work of God's grace. He denied just as vehemently that justification is the gift of God's pure grace. He could not but deny it in the interest of his cardinal teaching that man still possesses a free will. The two heresies go hand in hand. Indeed, they are at bottom one. They are both the protest of the same pride of the human heart against the same blessed truth of salvation by grace. You will notice that neither Luther nor Erasmus treats this matter as two separate subjects. They speak of both on the same page in the same paragraph and sentence. (Some repetition of the same quotations in this instalment of our series is therefore unavoidable. It will do no harm in any case.) One who attributes to man powers for good in the sphere of conversion will, consciously or unconsciously, let similar or the same powers operate in the sphere of justification. And one who believes that he can effect, wholly or in part, his justification will insist, of course, that he can effect, wholly or in part, his conversion. What, in fact, constitutes conversion, in the mind of Erasmus and the rest of the Catholic theologians? Is it the acceptance, by faith, of the gift of the forgiveness of sins offered in the Gospel? No, but the turning from sin to holiness and this sanctification is the essence of justification. Giving battle to the free-will advocates, Luther was defending the chief article of the Christian religion. "Herewith

I reject and condemn as nothing but error all dogmas which extol our free will, as they directly conflict with the help and grace of our Savior Jesus Christ. For since outside of Christ death and sin are our lords and the devil our god and prince, there can be no power or might, no wisdom or understanding, whereby we can *qualify ourselves, or strive after, righteousness* and life." (Luther, quoted by the *Formula of Concord. Triglot,* p. 897.) The denial of the *sola gratia* in conversion and the denial of the *sola gratia* in justification are conceived in the same womb, — the free-will heresy, — are blood-relatives and inseparable companions. "Daher von Anfang der Welt immer mit eingelaufen ist die Hauptketzerei, die man heisst der Pelagianer, *vom freien Willen und Verdienst der Werke,* welche sich hat allezeit neben eingeflochten und angeklebt wie der Kot am Rade." (Luther, VIII, 1001.)

Erasmus wrote his treatise *De Libero Arbitrio* for the purpose of upholding the papistical doctrine of justification by grace and works. "Although sin abound by the Law, and where sin has abounded, grace much more abound, yet it does not therefore follow that man, doing by God's help what is pleasing to Him, cannot by works morally good prepare himself for the favor of God." (P. 284.[41] — XVIII, 1643.) "If there be no freedom of will, how can there be place for merit? And if there be no place for merit, how can there be place for reward? To whom will the reward be assigned if justification be without merit?" (P. 352. — XVIII, 1937.) The papists loved to hear this and "loudly boasted that Erasmus's little book had saved the teaching of righteousness by works." (Justus Jonas, XVIII, 1669.) They were listening to the voice of Satan. Hear the voice of God, speaking in Scripture, brought to us by Luther: "The being justified through grace will not allow of respect unto the worthiness of any person, as the apostle saith: 'If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace,' Rom. 11:6. He saith the same also chap. 4:4: 'Now, to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt,' Rom. 4:4, thus most manifestly excluding all works in the matter of justification, to the intent that he might establish grace only and free justification." (P. 356.) "Here is no way by which 'free will,' with its devoted efforts and endeavors, can escape or get off; it must be numbered with 'him that worketh' or with 'him that worketh not.' If it be numbered with 'him that worketh,' you hear that righteousness is not imputed unto it; if it be numbered with 'him that worketh not but believeth' in God, righteousness is imputed to it." (P. 359.) Rom. 3:22–26: "Being justified freely by His grace." "Here Paul speaks forth very thunderbolts against 'free will.'" (P. 347.) Listen to the voice of Isaiah, hear the gra-

41) *Bondage of the Will,* Cole-Atherton translation.

cious words of our Lord, Is. 40:1, 2: "Comfort ye, comfort ye, My people, saith your God. . . . Her warfare is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sin." "He comforted her with tender words. As though God had said, I am compelled to forgive them their sins if I would have My Law fulfilled by them; nay, I must take away My Law entirely when I forgive them; for I see they cannot but sin, and the more so, the more they fight. . . . And it is thus that the iniquity is pardoned: without any merit, nay, under all demerit. . . . They do not obtain it by their own powers or on account of their own merit, but they receive it from the Conqueror and Giver, Jesus Christ. . . . Could I therefore suffer this most beautiful passage to be thus bedaubed with Jewish filth cast upon it by Jerome and the *Diatribe*? God forbid! No! My Isaiah stands victor over 'free will' and clearly shows that grace is given, not to merits or to the endeavors of 'free will' but to sins and demerits." (P. 281 ff. — XVIII, 1880.) "Here God is to be honored and revered as being most merciful towards those whom He justifies and saves under all their unworthiness" (p. 385). Hear another gracious word of the Lord, Matt. 25:34. "How can they merit that which is theirs and prepared for them before they had existence? . . . The kingdom is not merited but before prepared, and the sons of the kingdom are before prepared for the kingdom but do not merit the kingdom for themselves" (p. 191). Be sure to read all the other grace-passages which Luther quotes and drives home.

And where in Scripture are *work*-passages to be found, passages which declare that man is able to perform works which merit justification? Erasmus points to hundreds of passages to prove that man can effect his own justification = sanctification. He keeps on asking: "To what purpose is this great multitude of commandments if it is absolutely beyond every man's power to keep the commandments?" (*Diatribe*, 18, 1623.) And Luther keeps on telling the self-righteous free-will men: "How can that endeavor toward good 'which is death,' which 'is enmity against God' and 'cannot' be subject to Him? Rom. 8:5 ff." (p. 364). "Evil altogether, and nothing but evil, is thought or imagined by man throughout his whole life. The nature of evil is described to be that which neither does nor can do anything but evil, as being evil itself, Gen. 8:21; Matt. 7:17 f." (p. 279). "Surely he that saith 'all' excepts no one in any place, at any time, in any work or endeavor, Rom. 3:23" (p. 350). "The design of the whole epistle [to the Romans] is to show that we can do nothing, even when we seem to do well" (p. 245). The doctrine of justification by works and grace stands and falls with the doctrine of the freedom and power of man's will. And "these words [Gen. 8:21; Rom. 3:20–26, etc. etc.]

bring that miserable thing 'free will' to nothing, nothing at all" (p. 347).

Why, the natural man does not even know what sin is. How can he strive to rid himself of sin? He does not know what righteousness is. How can he devise ways and means of acquiring it? "This is the voice of the Gospel, revealing Christ as the Deliverer from all these evils. Neither 'free will' nor reason can discover Him. And how should it discover Him when it is itself dark and *devoid even of the light of the Law,* which might discover to it its disease (Rom. 3:20), which disease, in its own light, it seeth not, but believes it to be sound health?" (P. 345 f.) "Now let us come to John, who is also a most copious and powerful subverter of 'free will.' He, at the very outset, attributes to 'free will' such blindness that it cannot even see the light of truth; so far is it from possibility that it should endeavor after it. He speaks thus: 'The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not,' John 1:5" (p. 367). The case of free will is hopeless. It cannot take a single step. And it does not even know its impotency. Consequently, it spurns the helping hand. Rom. 1:17, 18 passes the death-sentence on *De Libero Arbitrio.* "It is manifest that 'free will' even in the most exalted of men, not only has wrought, and can work, no righteousness, but does not even know what is righteous before God" (p. 327. — XVIII, 1917). These words bring those miserable things, free will and the teaching of *De Libero Arbitrio,* to nothing — nothing at all!

The plea that free will can produce good works of a sort is of no avail. Let the advocate of work-righteousness read Rom. 3:22–26. "Here Paul speaks forth very thunderbolts against 'free will.' . . . To grant that 'free will' can, by its endeavor, move itself in some direction, we will say, unto good works or unto the righteousness of the civil or Moral Law; yet it is not moved toward the righteousness of God, nor does God in any respect allow its devoted efforts to be worthy unto the attainment of righteousness; for He saith that His righteousness availeth without the works of the Law" (p. 347 f.). The miserable sinner is undone if he follows the advice of the free-will advocate. He has no righteousness of his own, and on the advice of his counselor he refuses to plead the righteousness of Jesus Christ. The case of him who brings *De Libero Arbitrio* into court as his authority is hopeless.

The doctrine of justification by grace and works has no standing in the court of God. It is thrown out for this reason, too, that it presents its case under a false title. Erasmus's chief argument is that, since good works are commanded and "God would not command impossibilities," it must "lie in the power of man to keep the commandments." Luther answers: "Here again it does not see

that by these carnal arguments it refutes itself more directly than it refutes us. For what do these conclusions prove but that *all merit* is in the power of 'free will'? And then, *where is any room for grace?* Moreover, supposing 'free will' to merit a certain little and grace the rest, why does 'free will' receive the whole award?" (P. 272 f. — XVIII, 1873.) Such practises would not be allowed in any earthly court. Erasmus is defending the case of justification by grace *and* works. His arguments, if valid, would prove justification by works alone.

The pleading of the free-will advocates thus presents a sorry case. We have already heard how sharply Luther arraigns them for it. Whether they like it or not, they shall hear it again: "They [the Semi-Pelagians] are worse than the Pelagians themselves, and that on two accounts. First, the Pelagians plainly, candidly, and ingenuously assert the 'merit of worthiness,' thus calling a boat a boat and a fig a fig and teaching what they really think, whereas our 'free-will' friends, while they think and teach the same thing, yet mock us with lying words and false appearances, as though they dissented from the Pelagians; when the fact is quite the contrary. So that with respect to their hypocrisy they seem to be the Pelagians' strongest opposers but with respect to the reality of the matter and their heart-tenet they are twice-dipped Pelagians. And next, under this hypocrisy they estimate and purchase the grace of God at a much lower rate than the Pelagians themselves. For these assert that it is not a certain little something in us by which we attain unto grace, but whole, full, perfect, great, and many, devoted efforts and works, whereas our friends declare that it is a certain little something, almost a nothing, by which we deserve grace" (p. 355. — XVIII, 1938). And this, too, shall be quoted again and again: "Therefore it is either false that we receive our grace for the grace of another, or else it is evident that 'free will' is nothing at all; for both cannot consist — that the grace of God is both so cheap that it may be obtained in common and everywhere by the 'little endeavor' of any man and at the same time so dear that it is given unto us only in and through the grace of one Man, and He so great!" (P. 371. — XVIII, 1951.)

Luther proceeds: "And I would also that the advocates for 'free will' be admonished in this place that, when they assert 'free will,' they are deniers of Christ." Luther charges those who teach justification by works or who teach justification by grace and works with the crime of crimes, with the crime of denying Christ, of perverting the Gospel, of subverting Christianity. "What need now of Christ! What need of the Spirit! . . . What need was there for Christ to purchase for us, even with His own blood, the Spirit, as though necessary, in order that He might make the keeping of

the commandments easy unto us when we were already thus qualified by nature!" (P. 175.) "In the New Testament the Gospel is preached; which is nothing else than the word by which are offered unto us the Spirit, grace, and the remission of sins attained for us by Christ Crucified; and all entirely free, through the mere mercy of God the Father, thus favoring us unworthy creatures, who deserve damnation rather than anything else" (p. 187). No, say the free-will men, both of the extreme and of the most moderate type, no such Gospel for us! We want a gospel that leaves some merit to man!

Luther took up arms against the Erasmianites to save the dearest treasure of the Church. And the battle is still on. Do not say that the danger is past. The free-will heresy is as alive in 1938 as it was in 1525. It is rampant throughout the world, throughout the external Church. Prof. Ernst Bergmann, a German heathen, concludes an article on "Sittlichkeit" with the words: "*Mein* Blut und *meine* Gerechtigkeit, Das ist mein Schmuck und Ehrenkleid" (see *Ev.-Luth. Freikirche,* Sept. 19, 1937), and the rest of the pagans throughout the world and the liberal theologians throughout the Church — Pelagians all — say the same. The Semi-Pelagianism of the Catholic religion is as vigorous as of yore. Not one word of the Canons and Decrees of Trent, which anathematize the doctrine of justification by grace alone, is being suppressed. Karl Adam of the Catholic faculty in Tuebingen still subscribes to *De Libero Arbitrio.* He writes: "According to the Catholic doctrine of justification justifying grace works in and through the human being, through his moral will and conduct, effecting an inward renewal and transfiguration of character, and so fits him for the kingdom of heaven. The Catholic doctrine recognizes the free moral action of man as a constituent and organic moral factor in the process of justification" (*Germany's New Religion* [1937], pp. 156, 158). Rome has not changed. The old evil Foe still means deadly woe.

And he has found many confederates within the ranks of the Protestant theologians. There is the great host of the Arminians among the Reformed and of the synergists among the Lutherans. In 1872 Doellinger asserted that "the great majority of the Protestant theologians in Germany at the present day hold, while they may use different language, essentially the old doctrine of the Church" (the Catholic doctrine), and Dr. Walther "is afraid that Doellinger is right. A theology which makes faith man's own achievement and finds the reason why certain men are saved while others are lost in their free self-determination, in their conduct, in their cooperation, differs from the Catholic doctrine of justification only in the terminology used" (*Lehre u. Wehre,* 1872, p. 352). And in 1930 *Our Sunday Visitor* said that "Lutheranism is all but dead

in the land of its birth" (see *Lutheran Witness,* 1930, p. 364). You can find a similar statement in *The Catholic Encyclopedia,* VIII, 576: The strict orthodoxy of the old Lutherans is confined to a few small groups. (See Pieper, *Chr. Dogm.,* II, 670.)

How much of this is true? This much: many, very many, of those who pass for Lutherans are synergists. Many of them speak right out. Prof. R. Jelke: "Der Suender eignet sich dieses von Christo Geleistete an, so dass sich in ihm das von Christo Geleistete potenziell, ethisch wiederholt. . . . Nur der Suender, der mit Christo gemeinsame Sache macht, der gewillt ist, in die Nachfolge des heiligen Gehorsams, den Christus bewiesen hat, einzutreten, kann Anteil empfangen an diesem Versoehnungsopfer." And this teaching is imputed to Luther! (*Die Grunddogmen des Christentums,* p. 64.) O. Kirn, professor of dogmatics at Leipzig, taught: "Reconciliation is *accomplished historically* in so far as the work of Christ is, for all times, the ethical basis and guaranty for pardoning the sinners, but it is at the same time a *progressive* process in so far as the work of Christ, procuring salvation, has the power to transform the life of humanity and conform it to God's will. In God's judgment this result forms a part of the work of reconciliation; *this power inherent in Christ's work is a factor (ist mitbegruendend) in the work of reconciliation.*" (*Grundriss der Ev. Dogm.,* p. 118.) Dr. Pieper comments: "That is virtually nothing else than the Catholic *fides caritate sive operibus formata.* . . . It transforms the Christian doctrine into Romish-pagan work-doctrine." (*Chr. Dogm.,* II, 430, 472.) Can you possibly find the Lutheran, the Biblical, doctrine of justification by faith, without works, expressed in the following presentation? "Wir wissen nur, dass wir unrecht sind vor Gott, nicht so wie wir sein sollten; Jesus Christ aber verkuendet uns, dass wir *dennoch* so, wie wir sind, *Gott recht* sind, seine Kinder, und zwar 'im Glauben,' dann, wenn wir uns durch Jesus Christ staerken lassen zu der vertrauensvollen Hingabe an Gott, unsern Vater; wenn wir ihm unser Herz oeffnen und schenken, dass sein Wille darin bestimmend wird. Dann, wenn uns solches Zutrauen geschenkt ist durch Christus, dann *haben* wir *Glauben,* dann sind wir Gott *recht* oder gerecht vor ihm." (Italics in original.) This appeared in a sermon outline published in *Pastoralblaetter,* Feb., 1934. (Editor, Dr. E. Stange.) Did Prof. R. Seeberg teach the Lutheran or the Catholic doctrine of justification? He says: "The justification which God accomplishes in the sinner is His continuous influence on the soul, through which it gradually becomes righteous; this influence continues till perfection is reached in eternity." (See E. Schott, *Fleisch und Geist nach Luthers Lehre,* p. 84.) Seeberg's justification is the *actus physicus* of the Catholic system. Schott calls attention to the fact that Prof.

K. Holl's teaching, according to his own declaration, is similar to that of Seeberg. Holl is calling for a Luther renaissance. But the gist of his treatise *Zur Verstaendigung ueber Luthers Rechtfertigungslehre* is: "When God justifies a man, He considers that the man *declared* righteous *actually* becomes righteous. God, *in anticipation* of the results of his own work and influence, pronounces the judgment of justification on man's heart. One may express justification in the formula 'God declares the *sinner* righteous,' but also in the formula 'God declares the *righteous* man righteous.'" (Quoted substantially in the words of Holl in Althaus, *Theol. Aufsaetze,* II, 32. See also O. Gerss, *Vergebung der Suenden,* p. 18.) This may suffice. The situation today is what it was forty-five years ago, when Adolf Zahn wrote: "The Lutheran doctrine of justification is no longer to be found in Germany. [The reader will understand the hyperbole.] And no one seems to be frightened by this fact. Rome may rejoice — the faculties are doing their best to kill the Reformation. Scripture is being profaned, the doctrine of justification neglected, our youth poisoned." (Quoted by Th. Graebner in *Dr. Francis Pieper, A Biographical Sketch,* page 7 f.)

Not all synergists go these lengths. Many of them, perhaps the great majority, adhere to the article of justification by faith, without works. And they believe it with all their heart. But every word they speak in favor of their synergistic delusion they speak against the chief article of the Christian religion. *In principle* they subvert the article of justification by faith, without works. At the colloquy of Herzberg (1578), when the synergists of Anhalt tried to sidetrack the discussion of Article III of the Formula of Concord, A. Musculus declared: "Ich sage nein! Denn wer im Artikel vom freien Willen nicht richtig ist, der kann auch im Artikel von der Rechtfertigung nicht richtig sein." He can, by the grace of God; but not if he knows what he is saying when he speaks for synergism. The fundamental thesis of synergism denies the essence of the doctrine of justification without works. Erasmus was a clear thinker and so assailed both the monergism of Luther and Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone. Luther was a clear thinker, too, and, as Dr. Pieper points out after quoting the remark of Musculus (*Lehre u. Wehre,* 29, p. 33 f.), he brought to bear "the thunderbolts" of Paul's teaching on justification against the Semi-Pelagian-synergistic heresy. What is the connection, the blood-relationship, between synergism and work-righteousness? When the synergists teach that faith is in part the product of man's own endeavor and power or define faith as an ethical achievement of man, they teach in effect that the sinner's justification depends on some sort of work and quality in man. Dr. Bente puts it this way: "The syner-

gists asserted: Man, too, must do his bit and cooperate with the Holy Spirit if he desires to be saved. Conversion and salvation therefore would depend, at least in part, on man's conduct toward converting grace, and he would be justified and saved not by grace alone, but by a faith which to a certain extent is a work of his own." (*Trigl.*, Hist. Introd., p. 125.) Read up on this in Pieper, *Chr. Dogm.*, II: 543, 612, 634, 671. Or put it this way: If the *subtle* synergists are right, if there is in some men, before their conversion, a good disposition, a favorable inclination, towards the Spirit's work, Rom. 4: 5 no longer holds good. God would not be justifying "the ungodly," but him who had already achieved the beginning of godliness. Both classes of synergists impugn the chief doctrine of Christianity, the consistent synergists directly, the inconsistent synergists in principle.

The Church is beset today by many foes. We are told to take up arms against the forces of Communism and atheism assaulting the city of God. We must do that. But there is a graver menace. There are foes within the walls — a great multitude. It seems inconceivable that, when Paul so often uses those universally applying words "all," "There is none that doeth good," we are justified by faith "without" the Law, words and sentences, contrary and contradictory to these universally applying words, have gained so much ground even within the Lutheran Church, words like these: There is something in man which is good and which endeavors after good. (See p. 361 f. — XVIII, 1944.) But so it is — the *sola gratia* needs to be guarded against many foes within the borders of the Church. The battle of 1525 must be refought in 1938.

We have not yet exhausted the subject of *sola gratia* as treated in *De Servo Arbitrio*. Luther discussed a number of other doctrines in this great book,[42] and his thesis called for that. All doctrines of Scripture are either subsidiary or complementary to the doctrine of saving grace. Let us study several of the more important ones as Luther presents them.

There is the doctrine of original sin. Luther had been using strong language in describing the ravages and the curse of original sin. That aroused the indignation of Erasmus. The *Diatribe* complains that Luther "makes of original sin an evil immeasurably great," teaching that "natural man cannot know God and can only hate Him," and that "even the regenerate sin in everything they do." (XVIII: 1663 f.) The indignation of Erasmus did not subside when he got Luther's answer in *De Servo Arbitrio*. What does Luther, what does Gen. 8: 21 teach on this subject? "Moses does not say that man is intent or prone to evil, but that evil

---

42) Quite a number. "*De Servo Arbitrio* is an outstanding model and *compendium* of true Bible theology." (Introduction to Vol. XVIII: 66.)

altogether and nothing but evil is thought or imagined by man throughout his whole life. The nature of his evil is described to be that which neither does nor can do anything but evil, as being evil itself" (p. 279). "Another passage, Gen. 6:5: 'Every imagination of man's heart is only evil continually.' Does God, I pray you, here speak of 'most men' and not rather of all men?" (P. 279.) And this total depravity, which inheres in all natural men, is not an "infirmity" (p. 278) but of such a vile, odious, damnable nature that it merits God's wrath and eternal damnation. "All merit wrath and punishment, Rom. 1:18; they do nothing but that which merits wrath" (p. 325). "What men, then, will you pretend to say, are not under the wrath of God?" (P. 326.) And *everything in man* merits wrath and punishment. "He who describes them all as being 'under sin' (Rom. 3:9), that is, the servants of sin, leaves them no degree of good whatever" (p. 332). Luther continues: "Nor can you evade this by saying: Although they are under sin, the best part of them, reason and will, is able to strive after the good. For if there remains in them such a striving, it would be false to say that they are 'under sin.' . . . The wrath of God revealed from heaven against them will, unless they are justified through the Spirit, damn them altogether (*totos*), which would not be the case if they were not totally given over to sin." (Weimar Ed., XVIII:760. Cp. St. L. Ed., XVIII:1921. Missing in Cole-Atherton.) Do you realize the full extent of the desperate condition Adam's sin brought upon us? "Nor should we sin or be damned by that one sin of Adam if the sin were not our own; for who could be damned for the sin of another, especially in the sight of God? Nor is the sin ours by imitation or by working; for this would not be the one sin of Adam, because then it would not be the sin which he committed but which we committed ourselves — it becomes our sin by generation. Rom. 5:12." (p. 361. — XVIII:1934.) "Original sin" means that Adam's guilt is imputed to us! And then we imitate and repeat it! It is a desperate condition. Even the Christian labors under the thraldom of original sin. "The nature of man is so evil, even in those who are born again of the Spirit, that it does not only not endeavor after good but is even averse to, and militates against, good. . . . The flesh with these affections wars against the Spirit in the saints" (p. 383 f.; cp. p. 390). What is the conclusion? "Original sin itself therefore will not allow of any other power in 'free will' but that of sinning and going on unto damnation" (p. 361).

Deny the Scripture teaching on original sin, wholly or in part, and you deny the doctrine of salvation by grace alone. "Was eine Kirche bei der Lehre von der Suende und Erbsuende saet, das erntet sie bei der Lehre von der Gnade." (A. Koeberle, *Wort*,

Sakrament und Kirche im Luthertum, p. 10.) Sow the seed of Pelagianism or synergism, and you will harvest the doctrine of self-salvation. The philosophical and theological systems, Koeberle goes on to say, that give everything to man take everything from God, and those systems that leave some power to man do not give everything to God. "But where nothing of self-sufficiency and self-glory remains to man, it remains for God to do everything, and the *soli Deo gloria* remains intact." And what do those systems and churches that sow the seed of "self-salvation" harvest? Saved souls? No man can be saved, no man will cast himself upon saving grace, if the seed of Pelagianism and synergism takes root in his heart.

And how widely and copiously this evil seed is being sown today! The philosophers have no conception of the dreadfulness of original sin, as little as the philosopher Erasmus had. "German idealism takes the question about the expiation of guilt more lightly than does Buddhism. Kant: I have transgressed against the Moral Law within me; then I can fulfil it again in the same freedom. It is thus that ethical idealism resolves the problem of guilt. Fichte takes the same path. 'The religious man knows no remorse over the past. . . . In so far as he was in God, what he has done is right and good.'" (K. Heim, *The Church of Christ,* etc., p. 78.) Are the theologians — the general run of them — making the sinner see his vile and desperate condition? "The prevalent conception of sin is fundamentally either Pelagian or Semi-Pelagian. Moxon judges that the statement that 'we are all Semi-Pelagians today' is not very far from the truth, 'since it is in close harmony with the tendencies of modern thought.' (*The Doctrine of Sin,* p. 13.) As a matter of fact, however, some have gone way beyond Semi-Pelagianism and outstripped even Pelagius himself in their volatilization of the concept of sin." (L. Berkhof, *Vicarious Atonement through Christ,* p. 35.) And have the Lutheran synergists retained the teaching of *De Servo Arbitrio?* Will they admit that man is totally corrupt, absolutely impotent in the spiritual sphere? Read the article in *Lehre und Wehre,* 1882, p. 144 ff., "Welche Haupt- und Grundlehren der Heiligen Schrift werden durch den Synergismus wesentlich verderbt und gefaelscht?" "Durch den Synergismus in jeglicher Gestalt wird wesentlich geschaedigt und verderbt zum ersten die Lehre von der Erbsuende." "Zum dritten faelscht und verderbt der Synergismus wesentlich die allertroestlichste Lehre der Heiligen Schrift, naemlich die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung des armen Suenders vor Gott" (p. 408). What a Church sows with respect to the doctrine of original sin it reaps with respect to the doctrine of grace.

It is a terrible thing for a Lutheran to deny the total corruption

of human nature, whether he does it in the gross manner of Pelagianism or in the subtle manner of synergism. Such a man betrays Luther. He is faithless to the trust God committed to him by the hand of Luther.[43] But worse, he thereby commits treason against the Gospel of saving grace. "Es ist auch nicht zufaellig, dass der Gegensatz Luthers gegen Rom gerade in dem dogmatischen Lehrstueck von der Erbsuende seine schaerfste Auspraegung erfahren hat. Wer etwa wiederum Luthers Ausfuehrungen ueber die Erbsuende aus den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln vergleicht [*Trigl.*, p. 478], kann unmoeglich Luthers scharfes Urteil als eine beilaeufige Aeusserung verharmlosen, wenn er von der Leugnung der Erbsuende sagt, das sei eine 'recht heidnische Lehre, die wir nicht leiden koennen; denn wo diese Lehre recht sollt' sein, so ist Christus vergeblich gestorben, weil kein Schaden noch Suende im Menschen ist, dafuer er sterben muesste.' Noch umfassender und schaerfer hat Luther diese Lehre in seiner vielleicht groessten reformatorischen Schrift, in *'De Servo Arbitrio,'* vertreten. In diesem gewaltigen geistigen Gespraech mit dem groessten humanistischen Geist seiner Epoche, Erasmus, hat Luther deshalb an der Lehre von der Erbsuende festgehalten, weil seine gesamte Glaubenserfahrung auf der Erkenntnis beruhte, 'dass ich nicht aus eigener Vernunft noch Kraft an Jesum Christum, meinen Herrn, glauben oder zu ihm kommen kann.'" (Dr. H. Lilje, in *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz.*, Dec. 10, 1937.) Ruthlessly we shall strip natural man of all his dignity and of all his powers; then he will be ready for the *sola gratia* in conversion and justification.

Another most important Bible truth stressed by Luther is the article of *gratia universalis*. The curse of original sin is universal; thank God, the grace of God is universal, too, and extends over all men. And we thank Luther for proclaiming this blessed truth so loudly, so eagerly. "It is the Gospel voice and the sweetest consolation to miserable sinners where Ezekiel saith, 'I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked but that the wicked turn from his way and live,' 33:11. And it is in all respects like unto that of Ps. 30:5. and that of Ps. 36:7 and that of Christ, Matt. 11:28: 'Come unto Me, all ye that labor'; and also that of Ex. 20:6. And

---

43) "Fuer jeden, der Luther etwas kennt, ist es kein Zweifel, dass er mit der Tatsache einer Erbsuende furchtbar Ernst macht. Er erlaeutert das in dem Lied fuer seine Kirche 'Dem Teufel ich gefangen lag, Im Tod war ich verloren, Mein' Suend' mich quaelte Nacht und Tag, Darin ich war geboren.' . . . Wieder ist es die Aufklaerung gewesen, die mit ihrem leichtbeschwingten Optimismus diese Lehre abbaute. . . . Aber war das dann nicht alles Abfall von Luther oder, wenn man es ethisch nimmt, 'Verrat' an ihm? . . . Mit *dieser* Renaissance erlebte Luther seinen schaerfsten Zusammenstoss: Erasmus! Da rissen Tiefen auf." (Prof. H. Preuss, in *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kz.*, Oct. 29, 1937.)

what is more than half of the Holy Scripture but mere promises of grace, by which mercy, life, peace, and salvation are extended from God unto men?" (P. 167. — XVIII, 1791.) "Luther fairly revels in such texts." (*Trigl.*, Hist. Introd., p. 210.)

The rumor has gone out that Luther, at least when he wrote *De Servo Arbitrio*, was under the spell of determinism. The gossips tell each other that this book has a Calvinistic slant. Have they read the book? Why, Luther fairly revels in such texts as praise the universality of grace. "God determines that His Gospel, which is necessary unto all, should be confined to no place, no time, but that it should be preached unto all, at all times, and in all places" (p. 62). "This word 'I desire not the death of a sinner' does nothing else than preach and offer divine mercy to the world" (p. 170). "God deplores that death which He finds in His people and which He desires to remove from them" (p. 172). And you dare not interpret that Calvinistically, for on the next page Luther says: "He desires that all men should be saved, seeing that He comes unto all by the Word of Salvation." "The God Incarnate, I say, was sent for this purpose, that He might desire, speak, do, suffer, and offer unto all, all things that are necessary unto salvation" (p. 181). "The meaning of John [John 1:12] is this — that by the coming of Christ into the world, by His Gospel, by which grace was offered but not works required, a full opportunity was given to all men of becoming the sons of God if they would believe. . . . John therefore is preaching, not the power of 'free will' but the riches of the kingdom of God offered to the world by the Gospel" (p. 198 f.).

The only reason why men are lost is because they reject the grace of God. *God would have all men to be saved!* "God desires that all men should be saved, . . . and it is the fault of the will, which does not receive Him, as He saith Matt. 23:37: 'And ye would not'" (p. 173). "The God Incarnate, then, here speaks thus: *'I would, and thou wouldest not'*" (p. 181). "John is preaching the riches of the kingdom of God offered to the world by the Gospel and signifying at the same time how few there are who receive it, that is, from the enmity of the 'free will' against it, the power of which is nothing else than this: Satan reigning over it and causing it to reject grace" (p. 199). No, no, Luther does not slur the article of universal grace. He made much of the *sola gratia* — on that our assurance of salvation rests. And he made much of the *gratia universalis* — on that our assurance of salvation rests.

Men say you cannot hold both, *sola gratia* and *gratia universalis*. The Calvinist is willing to teach the *sola gratia* on the authority of Scripture, but he cannot rid himself of the idea that the historical fact that many are not saved renders the teaching of

universal grace impossible; Scripture cannot be trusted at this point. The synergist has the *idée fixé* that, since grace is universal, the reason why only some are saved while others are lost must be that the former excel the latter in some way; what Scripture says on the SOLA *gratia* must be modified in some way. Moved by rationalistic considerations, the Calvinist and the synergist declare that you cannot teach both, salvation by grace and universal grace. Luther could teach both. He had a full share of the human *ratio* and saw the difficulty that here arises as well as the Calvinist and the synergist. But he also had a full share of Christian sense and was willing to defer the solution of this difficulty to the *lumen gloriae.* (See final instalment of this series.) Meanwhile, to meet the exigencies of the present sinful world, he taught the article of saving grace in its fulness. The terrified sinner needs to be told that grace does *everything.* And he needs to be told that grace extends over *all.*[44]

Let us take the time to review one more article as treated in *De Servo Arbitrio.* It is the fundamental doctrine of the means of grace. Where can I find the saving grace? That is a question of life or death to the terrified sinner. Let Luther answer it. Dr. Pieper says: "I know of no writing of Luther in which he so often and so forcefully, and that *ex professo,* inculcates the truth that every sinner should and can, with all confidence, lay hold of, and rely on, the *revealed* God, that is, on the *means of grace,* as his writing against Erasmus. 'The God Incarnate' [that is, God in Christ and in the means of grace], then, here speaks thus: 'I would, and thou wouldst not!' The God Incarnate, I say, was sent for this purpose, that He might desire, speak, do, suffer, and *offer unto all, all things* that are necessary unto salvation.' " (*Chr. Dogm.,* II, p. 181; quotation on p. 181, *Bondage,* etc. — XVIII: 1802.) Luther teaches that the grace of God can be found in no other way, at no other place, than in the means of grace. "Why does God not do what He does without the Word when He can do all things without the Word? I answer: Thus it pleaseth God — not to give the Spirit without the Word, but through the Word" (p. 193). Luther instructs the sinner to go to the Gospel for the forgiveness of sins, the grace of God. The Gospel bestows it (*vis dativa*): "The Gospel is nothing else than the Word, by which are offered unto us the Spirit, grace, and the remission of sins obtained for us by Christ Crucified; and all entirely free." (P. 187. — XVIII: 1806.) "John is preaching, not the power of 'free will' but the riches of the kingdom of God offered to the world by the Gospel" (p. 199). And this same Gospel creates and strengthens faith (*vis effectiva*):

---

44) More on this section in *Lehre und Wehre,* 1871, p. 166 ff.; Pieper, *Chr. Dogm.,* II, 595 f.

"By the Gospel, as the Word of offered grace, the bruised and afflicted are called unto consolation" (p. 162). "God says, 'I desire not the death of a sinner.' If there were not these divine promises standing, by which consciences afflicted with a sense of sin and terrified at the fear of death and judgment might be raised up, what place would there be for pardon or for hope? . . . With these words God is raising up, and comforting, the sinner lying under this affliction and desperation that He might not 'break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax' but raise him to the hope of pardon and salvation in order that he might be further converted, that is, by the conversion unto salvation from the fear of death, and that he might live, that is, might be in peace and rejoice in a good conscience" (p. 168 f.). The grace of God, which supplies every need of the sinner, is stored up in the means of grace, and this storehouse, filled to overflowing, is open to every sinner. "God determines that His Gospel, which is necessary unto all, should be confined to no place, no time, but that it should be preached unto all, at all times, and in all places" (p. 62).

Luther was a fit preacher of the grace of God in Christ. Let every minister of the Gospel of grace continue to study under Luther.

(To be concluded) TH. ENGELDER

Kleine Danielſtudien

4. Zwei merkwürdige Geſichte Daniels unter Belſazer

Die vier Weltreiche und das Reich des Menſchenſohns, Kap. 7

Mit dem 7. Kapitel beginnen die Geſichte Daniels, nachdem die erſten ſechs Kapitel die an göttlichen Wundern ſo reiche Geſchichte dieſes Gottesmannes geſchildert haben. Daniel ſchaute dieſe wunderbaren Geſichte, die beſonders dem Buche ſeinen apokalyptiſchen Charakter geben, unter den verſchiedenen in den früheren Artikeln geſchilderten morgenländiſchen Herrſchern, unter Belſazer, Kap. 7, 1; 8, 1; Darius, 9, 1; Cyrus, 10, 1. Vgl. das im Aprilheft, S. 275, und im Maiheft, S. 340, Geſagte und über die ſogenannte Apokalyptik, S. 337. Auch in der folgenden Darſtellung, namentlich in den hiſtoriſchen Ausführungen, benutzen wir wieder die S. 340 genannten Werke, beſonders Stokman.

Die erſte Viſion, die Daniel ſieht, iſt ein Traumbild von den vier Weltreichen und dem Reich des Menſchenſohns. Genau wird die Zeit angegeben, in der ſie ihm zuteil wurde, im erſten Jahr des Königs Belſazer, Kap. 7, 1. Die Erzählung greift alſo in der Zeit zurück, da Kap. 5 ſchon der Untergang Belſazers und Kap. 6 die Regierung des Darius geſchildert war. Es iſt eine große Viſion, die Daniel hier hat,

aus der Christus, der in den Wolken des Himmels kommende Menschensohn, und der Antichrist hervortreten. Daniel hat diese Vision, die er in einem Traum hatte, nach seinem Erwachen aufgeschrieben. Die Deutung des Gesichts ist verhältnismäßig leicht, da das ganze Traumbild eine Ergänzung des Traumbildes des Nebukadnezar ist, Kap. 2. Das große Meer, das Daniel erblickt, bedeutet in der biblischen Bildersprache das gewaltige, unstete, ruhelose Meer und Gewoge der Völkerwelt. Die vier Winde sind mächtige Zeitströmungen, die die Völkerwelt erregen. Gerade die Vierzahl ist wieder genannt wegen der vier Himmelsgegenden, aus denen die Winde hervorbrechen. Es ist auch hier die Zahl der „Ökumenizität". Und Daniel sieht nun vier furchtbare Raubtiere, die andere Geschöpfe überwältigen, zerreißen und verschlingen, einen Löwen, einen Bären, einen Leoparden oder Panther und ein greuliches und schreckliches Untier mit eisernen Zähnen und zehn Hörnern, zwischen denen ein kleines, vieläugiges, großmäuliges Horn hervorwächst. Er sieht dann den Alten der Tage, Gott den Vater, auf einem Richterstuhl; dieser richtet die vier Tiere, und dann wird das ewige Reich dem Menschensohn übergeben. Ein Engel deutet dem Daniel die vier Tiere und sagt ihm, daß damit vier Reiche gemeint seien, gibt auf Daniels Frage und Bitte hin besonders Aufschluß über das vierte Tier und seine zehn Hörner und das eine Horn. Die zehn Hörner werden Königreiche sein, ebenso wie die zehn Zehen in Nebukadnezars Bild, Kap. 2, 41–43. Das kleine dazwischen hervortretende Horn wird eine schreckliche Erscheinung sein, mächtiger als alle andern Reiche, wird Gott lästern und die Heiligen des Höchsten verstören, und zwar eine bestimmte Zeitlang, V. 25, aber nicht, wie Luther übersetzt, „eine Zeit und etliche Zeiten und eine halbe Zeit", auch nicht, wie die englische Bibel übersetzt, "until a time and times and the dividing of time", sondern: eine Zeit und zwei Zeiten und eine halbe Zeit, drei und ein halb; und dann wird das Gericht des Höchsten kommen und das ewige Reich. Hier finden wir schon die Zahl drei und ein halb, die dann weiterhin in Daniel und besonders auch in der Offenbarung St. Johannis so bedeutsam ist. Es ist die Hälfte der Siebenzahl. Die Siebenzahl, die bekannte „heilige" Zahl, ist die Zahl der Vollendung, der Vollkommenheit, die in der Schrift und namentlich wieder in der Offenbarung so häufig vorkommt. Die Zahl drei und ein halb, wo immer wir sie finden, auch mit anderer Bezeichnung, ist die Unglückszahl, genauer gesagt, die Zahl des Antichristen. Vgl. Dan. 9, 27 („mitten in der Woche", wörtlich: in der Hälfte der Siebenheit); 12, 7; Offenb. 11, 2 (42 Monate = drei und ein halb, nach Jahren berechnet); V. 3 (1,260 Tage = drei und ein halb, nach Jahren berechnet, wobei 360 Tage auf ein Jahr kommen), V. 11; Kap. 13, 5. Diese Zahlen sind nicht menschlich zu berechnen, weder auf Tage noch auf Monate noch auf Jahre, sondern es sind sogenannte prophetische, ideale, symbolische Zahlen, von denen später noch besonders die Rede sein wird. Wenn aber schon hier die Frage auf-

geworfen werden sollte: Warum setzt Gott solche Zahlen in die Heilige Schrift, wenn wir sie doch nicht nach unsern menschlichen Begriffen und Zahlen berechnen können, so ist die Antwort: Gott will uns damit lehren, daß in seinem ewigen, weisen Rat alles bis auf das einzelnste bestimmt ist, und gebraucht dabei arithmetische Zahlen, die als das Gewisseste und Festeste in der Welt gelten. Der Antichrist darf und wird auch keine Minute länger bleiben und wüten, als Gott in seinen Gedanken festgesetzt hat, wenn wir diese auch nicht ermessen und ergründen können. Die ganze Zahlensymbolik der Heiligen Schrift gehört mit zu der heimlichen, verborgenen Weisheit Gottes, im Daniel und in der Offenbarung gerade zu der sogenannten apokalyptischen Weise der Darstellung; vgl. wieder das im Maiheft, S. 337, Gesagte. Darum soll man auch nicht versuchen, diese verborgene Weisheit Gottes zu ergründen mit allerlei willkürlichen Berechnungen und Vermutungen, sondern streng nur den Andeutungen folgen, die Gottes Wort uns an die Hand gibt, und vor aller Spielerei mit Zahlen sich hüten. Und wenn weiter gefragt wird: Warum hat denn Gott überhaupt auch schwierige Aussagen und Sachen und nicht lauter klare, allgemeinverständliche Dinge in die Schrift gesetzt, so gilt wieder die Antwort, die schon der alte Kirchenvater Augustinus gegeben hat: „Wunderbar und heilsam hat der Heilige Geist die heiligen Schriften so abgemessen, daß er durch die klareren Stellen dem Hunger entgegenkomme, durch die dunkleren aber dem überdruß wehre.“ [1])

Das erste Tier gleicht einem Löwen und hat Flügel wie ein Adler. Das ist das babylonische Weltreich, das von Nebukadnezars Vater, Nabopolassar, gegründet und von Nebukadnezar auf seine Höhe gebracht worden war. Der Löwe ist der König unter den Tieren, und mit ihm wird Nebukadnezar und sein Reich verglichen wegen der unwiderstehlichen Stärke, mit der er die Völker Asiens zu Boden warf. Und zugleich hat er die Flügel eines Adlers. Der Adler ist der Herrscher der Lüfte mit seinem hohen, schnellen und sicheren Flug; so ist Nebukadnezar und das babylonische Reich siegreich dahingefahren und dahingeflogen über die Ländergebiete Vorderasiens, wie schon Jeremias in seiner erschütternden Weissagung über Babel, Kap. 48, 40; 49, 22, ihn bezeichnet hatte. Die Schwungfedern wurden ihm ausgerauft. Das geschah, als Nebukadnezar wegen seiner Selbstüberhebung durch seinen Wahnsinn zu den Tieren des Feldes erniedrigt wurde. Aber er wurde wieder aufgerichtet zu menschlicher Stellung und Würde und hatte eines Menschen Herz, erfuhr eine innere Umwandlung. Das zweite Tier gleicht einem Bären; das ist das medo-persische Reich. Der Bär ist dem Löwen ähnlich an Kraft, aber er ist plump, zottig, täppisch; ihm fehlt die gewaltige und furchterregende Majestät des Löwen. So war der Bär ein Sinnbild des starken, aber ungelenken, schwerfälligen medo-persischen Reichs. Der

1) ***De Doctrina Christiana*** **II, 6: Magnifice et salubriter Spiritus Sanctus ita scripturas sanctas modificavit, ut locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret.**

Bär ruht auf seinen Füßen, aber hebt die Füße der einen Seite zum Aufstehen oder Gehen auf und hebt damit die Schulter dieser Seite oder den ganzen Körper auf dieser Seite empor. Das weist darauf hin, was schon Kap. 2, 32 mit Brust und Armen angedeutet war, daß das zweite Reich ein geteiltes Wesen an sich tragen wird; mit andern Worten, es weist hin auf das träge, wuchtige, nach seinen Anstrengungen ruhende Medien und auf das aufstehende und zu neuem Raub gerüstete Persien. Das Tier hat drei Rippen im Maul. Das bedeutet wohl, daß es nach drei, nicht nach vier Seiten hin die Welt erobert hat. Tatsächlich hat das medisch-persische Reich wohl das babylonische, das lydische und das ägyptische Reich an sich gerissen, aber nicht Griechenland. Wenn dieses zweite Tier aufgefordert wird: „Stehe auf und friß viel Fleisch", V. 5, so liegt darin, daß dieses Reich große Ländergebiete verschlingen wird. Das dritte Reich, der Leopard oder Panther mit vier Flügeln und vier Köpfen, ist das von Alexander dem Großen gegründete mazedonische Weltreich. Der Leopard zeichnet sich aus durch die bunte Schönheit seines gefleckten Pelzes, besonders aber durch die Schnelligkeit seiner geschmeidigen Glieder, mit denen er große und weite Sprünge machen kann. Die Vierzahl der Flügel weist hin auf den schnellen Siegesflug nach allen vier Himmelsgegenden hin, um die ihm von Gott verliehene Gewalt auszuüben. Und tatsächlich war das griechisch-mazedonische Weltreich ein die Welt überschauendes und die Welt durchfliegendes Reich. Dieses dritte Tier hatte aber auch vier Köpfe. Das weist darauf hin, daß diesem Tier die Einheitlichkeit des Willens fehlt; die Spaltung in eine Vierzahl von Köpfen ruft hervor eine Zersplitterung seiner Kraft. Es ist in der Tat eine überaus zutreffende Zeichnung des dritten Weltreichs, das unter Alexander wie ein Panther mit weitem Sprung seine Beute erhaschte und wie ein Vogel den Erdenraum durcheilte. In seinem Reiche fand sich die farbenreiche Schönheit der griechischen Kultur, aber es wurde auch, bald nach dem frühen Tode Alexanders, gespalten in die vier sogenannten Diadochenreiche seiner Nachfolger, unter denen besonders Syrien und Ägypten hervorragten.

Die Tiere, die die Weltreiche darstellen, treten in geschichtlicher Reihenfolge auf; darum kann mit dem vierten schrecklichen, scheußlichen Tier kein anderes Reich gemeint sein als das römische. Das war wirklich ganz anders als die ihm vorangehenden Reiche. Durch eiserne, alles zermalmende Kraft und brutale Gewalt, mit eisernen Zähnen und ehernen Füßen hat es ein Volk nach dem andern zu Boden getreten. Der heilige Seher kann dieses Tier mit keinem andern vergleichen und gibt ihm auch keinen Namen; denn Rom war damals noch nicht in Berührung mit Israel gekommen, war noch ungenannt und unbekannt, während die Griechen schon bei Joel, Kap. 3, 11 (in der englischen Bibel, V. 6) erwähnt werden. Diese Deutung der vier Tiere auf die vier Weltreiche und namentlich die Deutung des vierten Tieres auf das Römerreich war die Deutung der alten jüdischen Gelehrten. Sie findet sich schon in dem

apokryphiſchen vierten Esrabuch, ſpäter bei dem Kirchenvater Irenäus und wurde im Mittelalter ganz allgemein anerkannt, ſo daß Luther ſagen konnte: „In dieſer Deutung und Meinung iſt alle Welt einträchtig, und das Werk und die Hiſtorien beweiſen's auch gewaltig.“ So iſt es wirklich. Die zehn Hörner des vierten Tieres bedeuten dann, wie der Engel ausdrücklich ſagt, zehn aus dem römiſchen Weltreich entſtehende Könige oder Mächte, V. 24. Sie ſitzen an einem Kopf. Die Zerteilung in zehn Reiche hier iſt keine Schwächung, ſondern vielmehr eine vollſtändige Entfaltung ſeiner Kraft. Das elfte Horn aber, das aus kleinen Anfängen zwiſchen den zehn Hörnern hervorwächſt, iſt niemand anders als der Gottesfeind, der Antichriſt, den Paulus 2 Theſſ. 2 malt und von dem dann die Offenbarung ſo viel ſagt, beſonders Kap. 17, 12. 13. Nach der ganzen Schrift, ſchon nach Bileams Weisſagung, 4 Moſ. 24, 23. 24 (Chittim = Zypern = vom Weſten her) und nach Sacharjas Geſicht von dem fliegenden Epha, Kap. 5, 5–11 (Sinear = Babel = Rom), vor allem aber nach Daniel, 2 Theſſ. 2 und der Offenbarung entſteht das antichriſtiſche Reich aus dem römiſchen Reich. Die Augen des Horns weiſen hin auf einen mit Vernunft begabten Menſchen. Das Maul, das große Dinge redet, weiſt hin auf freches, ſtolzes, hochmütiges Reden, ein rechtes „Großmaul“, V. 20. Das iſt der Antichriſt, der Papſt zu Rom, wie die Kirchengeſchichte genugſam zeigt. Und dann wird eine großartige Gerichtsſitzung geſchildert, eine Sitzung des höchſten Richters, des Weltrichters und ſeiner Beiſitzer, des großen, allerhöchſten Gottes und ſeiner Heiligen. Er iſt der Ewige, der Alte der Tage, Ancient of Days, der in einem ſchönen weißen Gewand erſcheint als der vollkommen Heilige. Das Haar auf ſeinem Haupt iſt wie reine weiße Wolle. Seine Richterkrone beſteht aus Feuerflammen; das weiſt hin auf die zornflammende Strenge des Richters. Der Thron ruht auf flammenſprühenden Rädern, ähnlich wie der Prophet Heſekiel, Kap. 1, ein ſolches Geſicht ſah. Dadurch wird die Allgegenwart des göttlichen Richters angedeutet, die über die ganze Erde geht und der niemand durch die Flucht entrinnen kann. Der Feuerſtrom, der ſich von ihm aus ergießt, iſt ein Sinnbild der richtenden göttlichen Gerechtigkeit, die alles mit Flammen verzehrt, was vor der Heiligkeit Gottes nicht beſtehen kann. Immer erſcheint das Feuer in der Schrift als Symbol der göttlichen Nähe und der göttlichen Heiligkeit; vgl. z. B. 2 Moſ. 3, 2; 19, 16–18; Jeſ. 6, 1–4. Vor dem thronenden Weltrichter ſtehen ſeine himmliſchen Scharen, die ſeine Befehle ausrichten in überwältigend großer Menge. Tauſendmal tauſend dienen ihm, und zehntauſendmal zehntauſend ſtehen vor ihm, V. 10.

Und dann beginnt das Gericht. Die Bücher werden aufgeſchlagen, in denen alle Werke der Menſchen verzeichnet ſtehen. Die Reiche gehen unter, es wird ihnen ihre Gewalt genommen — jedes hat ja ſeine beſtimmte Zeit und Stunde —, und ſchließlich wird auch das letzte, ſchreckliche Tier dem Feuer der ewigen Verdammnis überliefert. Alle Reiche

dieser Welt, eins nach dem andern, haben ihre Rolle ausgespielt, und nur ein Reich bleibt bestehen. Und so sieht nun Daniel in einem neuen Teil des Gesichts, wie einer in Menschengestalt kommt, aber auf den Wolken des Himmels, wie dieser vor den Alten gebracht und ihm Gewalt und ein unvergängliches Königtum verliehen wird, V. 13. 14. Das ist nicht ein irdischer König, das ist auch nicht das Volk Gottes, wie manche infolge einer falschen Auffassung des 27. Verses angenommen haben, sondern es ist niemand anders als Christus. Wir haben hier eine besonders klare und wichtige messianische Weissagung, auf die wir darum auch Wort für Wort in einem besonderen Artikel eingehen wollen.

Wir lesen ausdrücklich, daß Daniel ganz erschüttert ist und mit Entsetzen erfüllt, V. 15; und dann deutet ihm auf seine Bitte der Engel dieses ganze Gesicht, namentlich das vierte Tier mit seinen Hörnern. Gerade was wir da lesen, macht uns, wenn wir es vergleichen mit dem, was wir noch im Buche hören werden und was dann im Neuen Testament vom Antichristen gesagt wird, gewiß, daß das kirchliche Verständnis und die kirchliche Auslegung vom Antichristen die richtige ist. Aber dem HErrn Christo steht zur Seite im Kampf gegen den Antichristen das Volk der Heiligen des Höchsten. Das ist die gesamte Christenheit, die dann auch in der Offenbarung erscheint und dem Lamm zu Ehren das Lied singt: „Du bist erwürget und hast uns Gott erkauft mit deinem Blut aus allerlei Geschlecht und Zungen [Sprachen] und Volk und Heiden [Heidenvölkerschaften] und hast uns unserm Gott zu Königen und Priestern gemacht; und wir werden Könige sein auf Erden", Kap. 5, 9. 10. Die Christen werden nach dem Gericht über den Antichristen das große Triumphlied und Halleluja anstimmen, Offenb. 19, 1–7. Dieses Volk der Heiligen wird, wie unser Kapitel im 14. Verse hervorhebt, gesammelt aus allen Völkern, Leuten und Zungen. Und dieses Reich, das Reich Christi, in dem die Christen die Bürger sind, ist ein ewiges Reich; dieses Königreich hat kein Ende. Alle Gewalt wird ihm dienen und gehorchen, V. 27. Am Schluß des Kapitels heißt es dann noch, daß Daniel, als die Rede zu Ende war, in seinen Gedanken sehr betrübt war. Dieses Gesicht beunruhigte ihn so sehr, daß seine Gesichtsfarbe sich veränderte. Aber er bewahrte diese Sache in seinem Herzen.

Der Widder und der Ziegenbock, die vier Hörner und das kleine Horn, Kap. 8

Zwei Jahre nach dem Kap. 7 berichteten Gesicht, noch unter Belsazer, hatte Daniel wieder ein merkwürdiges Gesicht. Vom Geiste Gottes wurde er von Babel in das aus der Geschichte Abrahams bekannte Land Elam, 1 Mos. 14, 1, entrückt, das jenseits des Tigris lag, und zwar in die uralte Hauptstadt Susan am Fluß Ulai oder Euläus, in die Stadt, die später, wahrscheinlich schon bald nach ihrer Eroberung durch die Perser, eine glänzende Residenz der persischen Könige wurde und in den Büchern Nehemia und Esther erwähnt wird, Neh. 1, 1;

Esther 1, 1. 2. Daniel befand sich also in seinem Gesicht im Mittelpunkt des medo-persischen Weltreichs, dessen Untergang er voraussehen und weissagen sollte. Er sah im Geiste einen Widder mit zwei Hörnern. Das eine Horn war höher als das andere, und das höhere wuchs zuletzt empor. Und er sah dann den Widder nach Westen, Norden und Süden stoßen, und kein Tier konnte vor ihm bestehen. Wir brauchen hier nicht lange zu fragen, was mit diesem Widder und dem ganzen Gesicht gemeint ist. Ein Engel, der dann später mit seinem Namen genannt wird, Gabriel, das heißt, „Mann Gottes", erklärt es dem Seher. Dieser Name Gabriel wurde der irdische Eigenname dieses Engelfürsten, damit Daniel ihn später von andern Engeln unterscheiden könne. Er wird noch dreimal in der Schrift genannt: einmal von Daniel, Kap. 9, 21, und dann erscheint er dem Priester Zacharias und der Jungfrau Maria, Luk. 1, 19. 26. Er ist außer dem Engelfürsten Michael, der noch von Daniel erwähnt wird, der einzige Engel, den die Schrift mit Namen nennt. Der Widder bezeichnet nach V. 20 die Könige Mediens und Persiens; das niedrigere Horn bedeutet das alte medische Reich, das spätere höhere Horn das unter Cyrus mächtig werdende persische Reich. Die zwei Hörner weisen also wieder deutlich hin auf die Zweiteilung dieses Weltreichs; vgl. das im Maiheft, S. 343, Gesagte. Dieser schwerfällige Widder oder Schafbock mit den ungleichen Hörnern entspricht dem Bären mit den ungleichen Schultern im vorigen Gesicht, Kap. 7, 5, gerade wie dann der schnelleilende Ziegenbock, der den Widder vernichtet, dem gefleckten Leoparden oder Panther im vorigen Gesicht entspricht. Wir sehen hier Schwerfälligkeit und Schnelligkeit, Wucht und Geschmeidigkeit. Das Stoßen des Widders bedeutet seine kriegerischen Unternehmungen und Machtausdehnungen. Er stößt nach drei Seiten hin, nach Westen, nach Norden und nach Süden, wie im vorigen Gesicht sich drei Rippen im Maul des Bären befanden. Rückwärts nach Osten stößt der Widder nicht, und tatsächlich hat sich nach dieser Richtung hin das medo-persische Reich wenig ausgebreitet. Aber nach Westen hin hat das persische Reich Babylonien, Syrien und Lydien erobert, nach Norden hin Armenien und die skythischen, südrussischen Völkerschaften, nach Süden unter Kambyses, dem Sohn des Cyrus, Ägypten, Arabien und Libyen. Und dann rast ein Ziegenbock vom Westen her, läuft auf den Widder zu, der am Fluß steht, stößt ihn, zerbricht seine Hörner und zertritt ihn. Der Ziegenbock hat nur ein einziges, großes, mächtiges Horn. Seine Schnelligkeit ist so groß, daß er den Erdboden gar nicht zu berühren scheint. Dieser Ziegenbock ist das griechisch-mazedonische Weltreich, und das große Horn an seiner Stirn ist, wie Gabriel ausdrücklich erklärt, der erste König dieses Weltreichs, Alexander der Große, V. 21, nach Nebukadnezar und Cyrus der dritte Welteroberer, von dem das Buch Daniel redet. Alexander war ein mit großen körperlichen Vorzügen und hohen Geistesgaben ausgestatteter Held. Er war erst zwanzig Jahre alt, als er den Thron bestieg, war durch den Unterricht

seines berühmten Lehrers, des Philosophen Aristoteles, mit der griechischen Bildung vertraut geworden, und seine ihm von Gott zugewiesene Lebensaufgabe war, die griechische Sprache in die Länder hinauszutragen, damit sie einmal später das Mittel werde zur Verbreitung des Christentums. Gott lenkt die ganze Weltgeschichte nach seinem Willen und Wohlgefallen im Interesse und zum Besten seines Reiches. Als Christus geboren wurde, war das Griechische die Weltsprache, und das Neue Testament ist in der Weltsprache geschrieben. Alexander zerstörte das medisch-persische Weltreich, kam auf seinem Zuge nach dem Osten auch nach Jerusalem, wo der Hoheprieſter Jaddua ihm entgegenkam, betete Jehovah an im Tempel und las diese Weissagungen Daniels über sich selber. Der jüdische Geschichtschreiber im ersten Jahrhundert der christlichen Zeitrechnung, Flavius Josephus, berichtet in seinen *Antiquitates Iudaicae:* "And when the Book of Daniel was shown him,[2] wherein Daniel declared that one of the Greeks should destroy the empire of the Persians, he supposed that himself was the person intended; and as he was then glad, he dismissed the multitude for the present; but the next day he called them to him and bade them ask what favors they pleased of him; whereupon the high priest desired that they might enjoy the laws of their forefathers and might pay no tribute on the seventh year. He granted all they desired; and when they entreated him that he would permit the Jews in Babylon and Media to enjoy their own laws also, he willingly promised to do hereafter what they desired; and when he said to the multitude that, if any of them would enlist themselves in his army on this condition, that they should continue under the laws of their forefathers and live according to them, he was willing to take them with him, many were ready to accompany him in his wars."[3]

Erst zweiunddreißig Jahre alt, starb Alexander; das große Horn zerbrach. Nach seinem Tode zerfiel sein Reich unter blutigen Kämpfen in die vier sogenannten Diadochenreiche (διάδοχοι = Nachfolger) seiner Feldherren. So wuchsen statt des einen großen Horns am Ziegenbock vier Hörner hervor, V. 8. Das nördliche Reich, das dem Lysimachus zufiel, umfaßte Thrazien und Bithynien; das westliche, das Kassander erhielt, bestand aus Mazedonien und Griechenland; das östliche, das dem Seleukus zuteil wurde, setzte sich zusammen aus Syrien, Babylonien und den östlichen Ländern bis nach Indien, und das südliche, das dem Ptolemäus zufiel, bestand aus Ägypten, Palästina und dem steinigen Arabien. Von zwei dieser Reiche, dem syrischen Reich des Seleukus und

---

2) Die bekannte englische Ausgabe von Whiston, nach der wir zitieren, macht dazu die Anmerkung: "The place shown Alexander might be Dan. 7:6; 8:3-8, 20-22; 11:3, some or all of them very plain predictions of Alexander's conquests and successors."

3) XI, 8. 5, p. 311.

seiner Nachfolger, den Seleuziden, und dem ägyptischen Reich des Ptolemäus und seiner Nachfolger, der Ptolemäer, wird später von Daniel noch viel berichtet. Und aus einem dieser vier Hörner ging nun ein kleines Horn hervor und wurde übergroß nach Süden, nach Osten und nach dem „werten Land", "pleasant land", V. 9. Diese „Zierde" der Länder, das „herrliche Land", ist Palästina. Das Horn, das aus dem großen syrischen Reich des Seleukus hervorwächst, bedeutet den aus der griechisch-syrischen Dynastie entsprossenen König Antiochus IV., Epiphanes, „der Herrliche", the Illustrious, genannt, der von den Juden aus Feindschaft und Spott auch Epimanes, der Wahnsinnige, genannt wurde, der dann in Jerusalem eine greuelvolle Tempelverwüstung angerichtet hat und darum der alttestamentliche Vorläufer und Typus des Antichristen ist. Klein heißt das Horn, denn der Anfang der Herrschaft dieses Königs war klein; er stieg aus geringen Anfängen empor zu großer Macht. Er führte siegreiche Eroberungszüge nach Süden hin gegen Ägypten, nach Osten gegen Babylonien. Aber am meisten hatte unter ihm zu leiden das Land, wo die Herrlichkeit Gottes wohnte, das werte Land Palästina. Und Antiochus wollte dieses Land seines schönsten Schmuckes berauben, des wahren Gottesdienstes. Er wollte die Juden hellenisieren, wollte in Judäa, wie namentlich das erste Makkabäerbuch, obwohl ein Apokryphon, doch eine wertvolle Geschichtsquelle, erzählt, griechische Religion und Kultur einführen und fand bei vielen griechisch gesinnten Juden Entgegenkommen, 1 Makk. 1. In seinem frechen übermut wuchs dieses kleine Horn bis zum Himmel empor und warf etliche von den Sternen an dem Heer des Himmels zu Boden und zertrat sie. Das erklärt Gabriel mit den Worten, V. 24, daß er mächtige Leute und das Volk der Heiligen zugrunde richtete. Sogar den Fürsten der Höhe wagte er anzugreifen, den HErrn der Heerscharen, V. 25, indem er ihm den regelmäßigen öffentlichen Gottesdienst raubte. Wir wissen aus der Geschichte, daß Antiochus den Räucheraltar, den Schaubrottisch und den goldenen Leuchter aus dem Heiligtum wegnahm und daß sein Haß immer grimmiger wurde. Er verbot bei Todesstrafe die Verehrung Jehovahs, ließ die heiligen Schriften verbrennen, entweihte den Tempel durch einen auf den Brandopferaltar gestellten kleinen Altar des olympischen Zeus, des griechischen Obergottes, und versuchte auf alle Weise, die Juden zur Verleugnung ihres wahren Gottes zu bewegen, 1 Makk. 1, 43–68. Die wahre Religion wurde zu Boden geworfen, und der gottlose Tyrann triumphierte, Dan. 8, 12. 25. Da hört Daniel einen Heiligen reden; das ist ein Engel, einer der himmlischen Wächter, V. 13. Was er sagte, erfahren wir nicht, aber ein anderer Engel fragte den redenden Engel nach der Dauer der Unterdrückung und erhielt die Antwort, die der Engel dem Propheten direkt gibt: Bis zu zweitausend und dreihundert Abendmorgen, da wird das Heilige wieder in seinen rechten Stand gesetzt werden, V. 14. Luther hat übersetzt: „2,300 Tage, vom Abend gegen Morgen zu rechnen", die Authorized Version bloß: 2,300 days, die Revised

Version besser und genauer: 2,300 evenings and mornings. Was sind nun die Abendmorgen? Wir finden bei Daniel, wie schon bemerkt und wie noch weiter gezeigt werden wird, ideale, prophetische Zahlen, die wir nicht berechnen können. Wenn er hingegen Zahlen meint, die wir berechnen können, dann beschreibt er sie auch nach der gewöhnlichen Weise, und so hier. Nach dem biblischen Schöpfungsbericht, 1 Mos. 1, bestehen die Tage aus dem Wechsel von Abend und Morgen, und so sind hier Tage gemeint, die von einem Abend bis zum andern reichen, nach der jüdischen Zeitrechnung, die den Tag mit dem Abend beginnt, wie es immer in der Schöpfungsgeschichte heißt: „Da ward aus Abend und Morgen der erste, der andere Tag, der dritte Tag", 1 Mos. 1, 5. 8. 13. Zweitausend dreihundert Abendmorgen sind etwas über sechs Jahre, und so lange dauerte das Wüten des Antiochus. Im Jahre 169 vor Christo hörte der rechtmäßige, durch das Gesetz Mosis vorgeschriebene Opferdienst im Tempel auf, und im Jahre 163 schloß Lysias als Vormund des jungen Sohnes des Antiochus mit Judas Makkabäus, der mit seinem ganzen Geschlecht den Tyrannen bekämpft hatte, Frieden. Dies ist also eine Weissagung, die tatsächlich in Erfüllung gegangen ist. Eine Kirchenreformation fand statt, der Tempel wurde gereinigt und geweiht, die Opfer wurden wieder dargebracht und ein großes Freudenfest, eine herrliche Kirchweih, gehalten, ein Fest, das zu Christi Zeiten, Joh. 10, 22, und noch heute bei den Juden gehalten und Chanukke, Channea (Tempelweihfeier) genannt wird, 1 Makk. 4, 36–59; 2 Makk. 1, 9.

Einige Einzelheiten dürften noch erwähnt werden. Gabriel nennt den Daniel „Menschenkind", V. 17, gerade wie Hesekiel von Gott immer Menschenkind genannt wird; vgl. das in den „Kleinen Hesekielstudien" darüber Bemerkte, *C. T. M.*, VIII, 91. Das erinnert den Propheten an seine menschliche Schwäche gegenüber dem hohen, majestätischen Gott, der ihn besonderer Offenbarungen würdigt. Daniel wird von dem Klang der Stimme des Engels zu Boden geworfen und betäubt; aber der Engel berührt ihn und richtet ihn stärkend auf vom Erdboden, V. 18. Gabriel sagt dem Daniel, daß das Gesicht sich auf die bestimmte Zeit des Endes beziehe, V. 17. 19. Das ist aber nicht das absolute Ende aller Dinge, nicht die Zeit der Aufrichtung des Reiches der Herrlichkeit, sondern die Zeit des Gerichts über die Weltreiche und der Aufrichtung des ewigen Gottesreiches durch die Erscheinung des Messias. Daniel soll das Geschaute geheim halten, denn es gehe auf „viele Tage", V. 26. Tatsächlich vergingen noch viele, viele Jahre, bis dieses ganze Gesicht in der Geschichte sich verwirklichte. Gabriel hebt in seiner Erklärung auch hervor, daß Antiochus gegen den Fürsten der Fürsten sich erheben werde; aber ohne Zutun einer Menschenhand werde er zerbrochen werden, V. 25. Und so kam es wirklich; denn Antiochus starb ruhmlos zu Ende des Jahres 164, ohne Zutun einer Menschenhand, an einer Krankheit, 1 Makk. 6. Aber wenn man nun hier die Schilderung von seinem Wüten liest und damit dann 2 Thess. 2 und die Offenbarung St. Johannis ver-

gleicht, so erkennt man wirklich, daß Antiochus ein Typus des Antichristen ist. Der Antichrist ist der Mensch der Sünde und das Kind des Verderbens, „ein Widerwärtiger und der sich erhebt über alles, was Gott oder Gottesdienst heißet, also daß er sich setzt in den Tempel Gottes als ein Gott und gibt sich vor, er sei Gott", 2 Thess. 2, 4. Und es ist auch kein Widerspruch zwischen Kap. 7 und 8. Nach dem 7. Kapitel wird der Antichrist als elftes Horn zwischen den zehn Hörnern aufkommen und aus dem vierten Tier, das heißt, aus dem römischen Weltreich, erwachsen. Hier aber wird gesagt, daß das Vorbild des Antichristen, Antiochus Epiphanes, aus dem dritten Weltreich hervorgehen, daß an Stelle der vier Hörner ein kleines Horn hervorwachsen wird. Das zeigt eben, daß diese beiden Hörner, das elfte Horn in Kap. 7 und das kleine Horn in Kap. 8, nicht identisch sind, aber in naher Verbindung miteinander stehen wie Typus and Antitypus, wie Vorbild und Gegenbild. Kap. 7 gibt einen Überblick über den Gang der ganzen Weltgeschichte von den Tagen Nebukadnezars bis zum Weltgericht. Kap. 8 beschäftigt sich mit der Zeitgeschichte von der Gegenwart Daniels an bis zum Untergang des Antiochus Epiphanes. Gerade hier zeigt sich recht deutlich, daß die apokalyptische Darstellung, wie schon früher bemerkt, nicht verfährt in der Reihenfolge der Punkte einer Linie, sondern in konzentrischen Kreisen. Und auch hier wollen wir anbetend die sonderliche Weisheit Gottes erkennen, der solches alles dem Propheten geoffenbart und dann so genau und wunderbar erfüllt hat, und uns nicht irremachen lassen durch die moderne Danielkritik, die dies alles und anderes mehr als vaticinia ex eventu, nicht als Weissagung, Vorausverkündigung zukünftiger Dinge, sondern als Geschichtserzählung nach den geschehenen Ereignissen hinstellt und darum die Entstehung des Buches in die makkabäische Zeit, in die sechziger Jahre des zweiten Jahrhundert vor Christo, verlegt. Sellin sagt: „Man kann die Abfassungszeit des Buches fast bis auf den Monat bestimmen. Nach 8, 14 hat der Verfasser die Einweihung des Tempels durch Judas Makkabäus (vgl. 1 Makk. 4, 42–58) im Jahre 165 bereits erlebt. Den Tod des Antiochus Epiphanes im Winter 164 kennt er aber nach 11, 40–45 noch nicht, so daß man ihn mit höchster Wahrscheinlichkeit um die Jahreswende 164/65 ansetzen kann."[4] Und ähnlich sagt Kautzsch, daß ein unbekannter Jude Januar 164 das Buch in Angriff genommen habe. Droysen sagte in seiner Geschichte des Hellenismus: „Der Hävernickschen" (positiven, bibelgläubigen) „Auffassung kann kein vernünftiger Mensch beistimmen." Aber dagegen bemerkte Hengstenberg: „Die Beziehung auf die Makkabäerzeit und die ganze nichtmessianische Auslegung wird so lange falsch bleiben als das Wort Christi wahr, also in alle Ewigkeit."[5] Und R. D. Wilson schließt einen seiner trefflichen, leider in einer Zeitschrift zer-

4) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, S. 129.

5) Beide Zitate bei Behrmann, Das Buch Daniel, in Nowacks Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, S. XLVI, XLVII.

ſtreuten und verſteckten Artikel mit den ernſten, wahren Worten: "In the case of Daniel, Daniel is with us, Christ is with us. *Caveat criticus!*" [6] Aber wie weit die moderne Bibelkritik auch ſchon in die amerikaniſch-lutheriſche Kirche eingedrungen iſt, zeigt der neue im Kreiſe der United Lutheran Church erſchienene ***New Testament Commentary,*** **Herbert C. Alleman, Editor.** Dort ſagt Prof. N. T. Stamm vom Seminar in Gettysburg, Pa., in dem Kapitel "The Historical Relationships of Christianity" unter anderm: "The Book of Daniel was a tract written for these troublous times when King Antiochus, enraged by the failure of his plans to conquer Egypt, determined to punish the Jews for the trouble they had been making him." "Antiochus Epiphanes was the Darius of the Book of Daniel. He was also the Nebuchadnezzar with the golden image and the fiery furnace, the king whose very fury to compel the Jews to abandon their religion was self-defeating." "As we have already seen in our study of the Book of Daniel, apocalyptic is essentially past history written in the future tense. The apocalyptist wrote history in the form of prediction. This does not mean that he deceived his readers by writing under the assumed name of some ancient worthy such as Daniel or Enoch or Ezra. The writers of the apocalypses and their first readers understood the literary device. It was only the succeeding generations, for whom their works were not immediately intended, who began to misunderstand them." [7]

Am Schluß des Kapitels wird noch hervorgehoben, daß Daniel ganz dahingenommen war und mehrere Tage lang krank lag, ſo ergriffen war er von dieſer Offenbarung. Das können wir wohl verſtehen. „O welch eine Tiefe des Reichtums!" Röm. 11, 33–36. Voller Verwunderung war er über das Geſicht, aber niemand erfuhr es, und er verrichtete weiter ſeinen Dienſt am königlichen Hofe. L. Fürbringer

Sermon Study on Acts 5:34–42

Eisenach Epistle for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity

The time of peaceful, undisturbed spreading of the Gospel was past. The words of the Savior Matt. 10:17 had begun to be fulfilled. The Apostles Peter and John had been imprisoned and forbidden to teach in the name of Jesus, Acts 4:3, 18. Hearkening unto God more than unto the enemies, v. 19, they continued to preach salvation through the name of Jesus, performing many miracles, 5:12, 15, 16, and great multitudes both of men and women were added to the number of believers, v. 14. Viewing with alarm

6) ***Princeton Theological Review,*** 22 (1924), 401.
7) Aprilheft dieſer Zeitſchrift, S. 296.

the rapid spread of the Word, the high priest, together with some of the other leaders of the Sadducees, again were filled with indignation, with fanatical zeal, and determined to put an end to this movement, 5:17, 18; cp. Acts 4:1–3. Released by the angel, the apostles went to the Temple and preached. Disturbed by this manifest interference of a higher authority and perplexed "whereunto this would grow," fearful of the people, who would certainly avenge any act of violence against the apostles, tormented by their own conscience, v. 28 (last words), the enemies make one more effort to stop at least the preaching of Jesus as the Messiah by bullying the apostles into silence. The Lord fulfilled His promise, Matt. 10:19, 20. Before this august assembly the apostles boldly confessed Jesus of Nazareth as the only Savior, urged them who slew Jesus to repent and obtain forgiveness in His name, and pointblank refused to obey men rather than God, finally charging them indirectly with disobedience to God, 29–32. This bold, courageous speech so enraged the Sanhedrin that they took counsel to put them to death, momentarily forgetting their fear of the people. At this critical moment, while the members of the council were deliberating, consulting together (note the imperfect), Gamaliel rose, and by his advice succeeded in preventing his colleagues from committing a rash act and its fatal consequences for themselves and in saving the apostles from an untimely death.

V. 34: *Then stood there up one in the Council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the Law, had in reputation among all the people, and commanded to put the apostles forth a little space.* While, of course, there can be no absolute certainty in the matter, there is no reasonable doubt that the Gamaliel of our text and of Acts 22, 3 is identical with the renowned Gamaliel, who died about eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 53. What we know from other sources about the age, the character, the reputation, of Gamaliel the Elder, the grandson of the great Hillel, agrees so fully with what Luke tells us about the man, that practically all commentators identify the two. The school which his grandfather founded mediated between the rationalism, the worldliness, the epicureanism, of the Sadducees and the harsh, stern, literalistic legalism of the school of Shammai. Hillel was one of the most learned Rabbis of antiquity, a defender, in the main, of the old Jewish orthodoxy, yet able to adapt himself to changing circumstances, gifted with a flexibility altogether impossible to the school of Shammai, Hillel's great rival. Gamaliel seems to have inherited the intellectual power and the chief character traits of his grandfather. Luke tells us that he was "a Pharisee, a doctor of the Law, had in reputation among all the people." From other sources we learn that he was called the "Glory of the Law," and in the Mishnah his decisions are often

quoted, and usually favorably. In fact, he was the first of seven to be called Rabban, our teacher, a title conferring greater honor than the mere *Rabbi,* or *Rab.* The fixation of the annual calendar, of the new moons, the intercalary months, the festival days, was entrusted to him. The opinion and advice of such a man carried great weight, so that even his opponents did not dare to set it aside, partly because they saw the sanity, the reasonableness, of his position, partly because they feared to lose their prestige with the people if they would openly antagonize this influential man. At the same time Gamaliel was possessed of a broad-mindedness and toleration rarely met with in his sect. Many of his decisions and opinions as quoted in the Talmud lack the bigotry and sternness usually regarded as characteristic of Pharisaism, and some seem to have been given for the very purpose of mitigating some of the harsher customs advocated by former teachers. His toleration in matters pertaining to religion went so far that in Ptolemais he bathed in a hall wherein stood a statue of the pagan goddess Aphrodite, an abhorring to the ordinary Jew, an abomination particularly to the Pharisee. His pupil Saul evidently did not imbibe from him his spirit of liberalism and toleration but only the veneration for the Law of the fathers.

There is no foundation to the ancient tradition that Gamaliel became a convert to Christianity, was baptized by Peter and John, and that he was buried with Christian honors. Luke, writing after his death, would not have failed to mention his conversion if it had occurred. We shall see that our text gives not the slightest warrant for the belief that Gamaliel was a second Nicodemus, a secret disciple of Jesus.

Luke, the master historian, with a few strokes of the pen, pictures to us the authority, the prestige, the tolerance, the diplomatic astuteness, of this leader of the Jews. "Then stood there up one in the Council." Gamaliel recognizes that a critical moment has come. A decision of some kind must be made. He is not ready to go so far as the Sadducees, yet is not willing to oppose them in the presence of the apostles, since that would make them eye- and ear-witnesses of a possible dissension among the members of the Council. This must be prevented. First arrive at some unified course of action; then let the apostles hear their unanimous decision. He rises to his feet, drawing the attention of the apostles away from the discussions of the Sadducees and that of the Sadducees from their angry argumentations. All eyes and minds are fixed on him, the man whose authority was recognized and acknowleged by all. He makes use of this authority by commanding that the apostles "be put forth a little space," or, as it also may be translated, a little while. On a former occasion, Acts 4:15, the Council had commanded the apostles to "go aside out of the Coun-

cil." Here Gamaliel personally commands the servants to remove the apostles from the council chamber. His command is carried out at once; no one questions his right to demand their removal even before he has stated any reason for his action. And now he turns to the Sadducees in an effort to win them over to a more tolerant view of the situation. In order to gain his point, he no longer commands, but uses the language of tactful persuasion. "Ye men of Israel," "men, Israelites," he addresses them. That was the theocratic name of the Jews, reminding them that they were members of the covenant people. They are Israelites, God's own chosen people. That very fact ought to induce them to listen carefully to what he has to tell them as men so highly honored. Note that Peter, Acts 2:22; 3:12, and Paul, 13:16, make use of this same exalted title to gain the attention and good will of their audience. Cp. also 2 Cor. 11:22 and Acts 21:28. He did not call them by their party name. His purpose was not to stress the difference between Sadducees and Pharisees, to use this occasion to deepen the rift between the two parties. In this crisis the council must present a united front, and for that reason he sought an opportunity to persuade the Sadducees not to be swayed by intolerant hatred and fanatical zeal but to adopt a policy of moderation, of watchful waiting, of suspended judgment, until matters would perhaps adjust themselves without their interference.

Take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do as touching these men. One might place a comma after τούτοις, as does Luther, or after ἑαυτοῖς, as in the Authorized Version. We prefer the latter construction. "In favor of the latter it may be said that the construction πράσσειν τι ἐπί τινι is very common, whereas προσέχειν ἑαυτοῖς is never found in connection with επί, and that this rendering rightly marks the evidently emphatic position of 'these men.'" *(Expositor's Greek New Testament.)* Gamaliel asks his colleagues to guard themselves, the Greek phrase being used quite frequently in the Septuagint for נִשְׁמַר, the Niphal expressing in the Hebrew the same reflexive use of the term as the Greek ἑαυτοῖς. They should give heed to their own interests and welfare. He assures them that he is not speaking from personal motives, from self-interest; that he is concerned only for their own welfare. His intention is to warn them before they have gone too far, before they decide on a way of action which might cause them bitter regrets, which they might vainly wish to undo. Consider carefully what ye are about to do; guard against undue hastiness in doing away with these men. There is really no need to hurry your decision; on the contrary, any rashness on your part may prove harmful to you. In order to calm them, he first calls their attention to the historical facts that other seemingly dangerous movements of a politico-religious nature came to naught without their interference,

in the natural order of events. Only after having shown them the needlessness of any hurried action does he speak of the evil consequences for themselves which might result from any overt act of violence against the apostles. Gamaliel was a master of diplomacy, and it need not surprise us that he gained his point.

Vv. 36, 37: *For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain, and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered and brought to naught. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing and drew away much people after him; he also perished, and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed.* Gamaliel reminds his colleagues of a fact well known to all of them. This was not the first time that the populace had been caught up in a movement which threatened to become nation-wide and to disturb the peace and welfare of the Jewish state. In fact, the past four or five decades had been a time, as Josephus states, when there were ten thousand disorders in Judea, which were like tumults because a great number assumed a warlike attitude. (*Ant.*, XVII:10, 4.) After naming several leaders who had "gotten together a multitude of men of a profligate character," Josephus continues: "And now Judea was full of robberies; and as the several companies of the seditious lighted upon any one to lead them, he was created a king immediately, in order to do mischief to the public." (XVII:10, 8.) Gamaliel names two of these leaders, both of whom had come to grief after disturbing the nation's peace, Theudas and Judas. Josephus also speaks of a Theudas, a magician, who persuaded the greater part of the people to follow him but was finally defeated and put to death by the Romans. According to Josephus this Theudas revolted under Emperor Claudius, ca. 45 A. D., while Gamaliel speaks of a Theudas living prior to the "days of the taxing," v. 37. This is not a historical inaccuracy on the part of Luke, as some critics hold, but Luke and Josephus quite evidently speak of two different men, both rebelling, both having the same name, but both living decades apart. The Theudas of Luke succeeded in gathering only four hundred men, which is a long way from "the greater part of the people," who followed the Theudas of Josephus. Theudas undoubtedly was one of the leaders in the ten thousand disorders of which Josephus speaks, and it is not surprising that he is not named by Josephus, who does not even mention Hillel and Gamaliel, although they were men of far greater fame than an obscure leader of four hundred dissatisfied people. Theudas rose up, proudly claiming that he was "somebody," a prophet perhaps or a special messenger of God. He succeeded in gathering about himself four hundred people, only to meet with an

untimely end. He was slain, his band scattered, the "somebody" brought to naught. At some later time, in the days of the taxing, ca. 6 or 7 A. D., Judas of Galilee (whom Josephus once calls the Gaulonite, perhaps because Gaulon [Golan] was his birthplace, and more frequently Judas the Galilean, because Galilee was the seat of his activity) drew away much people after him, ἱκανόν, sufficient, many, enough to cause serious disturbance. While Theudas seems to have been only a petty chief, the revolt of Judas undoubtedly assumed more dangerous proportions. Josephus tells us that even after his death and the scattering of his followers they again banded together and under the leadership of his sons again rebelled some years later, until the three sons were slain by the Romans. But whether the disorder was of nation-wide extent or embraced only a few followers, both leaders were slain, their followers scattered, dispersed; both movements came to naught. The underlying reason, though not here expressed by Gamaliel, is of course, in his opinion the godless character of the leaders and the ungodly spirit of rebellion which motivated the people.

Acts 5:38, 39: *And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.* Gamaliel sees that the waves of excited fanaticism no longer are running so high. The Sadducees are listening attentively. The time is ripe to make the application. "And now," καὶ τὰ νῦν, with respect to the present situation, "I tell you, Refrain from these men," withdraw from them, cease to vex them (cp. Luke 4:23; Acts 22:29), "and let them alone." The best manuscripts have ἄφετε, send them away, dismiss them, do not hinder them. Other manuscripts read ἐάσατε, the word that Jesus uses Luke 22:51, do not restrain them, put nothing in their way. "For if this counsel or this work" — the *or* does not distinguish two different objects, but two different names for the same object. If this counsel, this project, or call it this work (since it has passed beyond the stage of a mere plan), "is of men," — ἐξ denotes the origin, — proceeds from men, is devised and set into motion by men, "it will come to naught," will be dissolved from top to bottom, completely destroyed, utterly overthrown. On the other hand, "if it be of God," if God has planned this counsel, if God is carrying on this work, "ye can not overthrow it," or, as some manuscripts read, "them," "lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." To battle against this movement, if it should be of God, to resist and persecute and perhaps go so far as to slay these men, if they should be messengers of God, would stamp you in the opinion of all as θεομάχοι, battlers against God.

In the first *if* clause Gamaliel uses ἐάν with the subjunctive, denoting the "condition as undetermined with some expectation that it will be determined." The second *if* clause is introduced by εἰ with the indicative present. "The indicative states the condition as a fact. It may or may not be true in fact. . . . This is far the most common condition. It is the natural one to use, unless there is a special reason to use another. It is the condition taken at its face value without any insinuations or implications." (Robertson, *A Short Grammar*, pp. 161, 162.) From the fact that the second conditional sentence is introduced by εἰ with the indicative, interpreters have argued that Gamaliel was favorably inclined to Christianity or that Luke intended to imply such an inclination. Let us remember that even the conditional clause with εἰ and the indicative does not permit "any insinuations or implications" to be drawn as to whether the speaker regards the condition as true or not. Cp. Matt. 12:27, 28. Whether Gamaliel was inclined to Christianity or not cannot be ascertained from the form of the conditional sentence. The context tells us nothing about such a leaning toward Christ. His counsel was due to his abhorrence of intolerant bigotry and fanaticism, his natural mildness and liberality. Hence his advice to adopt a temporizing attitude, to suspend judgment, at least to refrain from severity and suppression, was not necessarily due to any sympathy for Christianity on his part but, as the *Expositor's Greek New Testament* observes, "the judgment of toleration and prudence," no more.

Gamaliel's policy of letting matters take their course, of suspending judgment until time has proved the value or worthlessness of any matter, of shaping one's opinion according to the success or failure of a movement, may at times (though by no means always) be justifiable in questions pertaining to business, politics, civic legislation, etc. His tolerance of religious tenets and doctrines differing from his own is, as far as civic legislation is concerned, the correct one, the only one in keeping with the principles laid down by Christ and His apostles in the New Testament. His effort to preserve peace and harmony within a community by making compromises, by relinquishing some rights and privileges in the interest of the public welfare, is a praiseworthy one so long as no moral obligation is violated. Yet there can be no doubt that his advice under the circumstances prevailing at that time is far from correct, far from being pleasing to God, far from promoting the welfare of his fellow-men and of the Church of God.

The question at issue at that council was not whether in a state constituted as modern states are religious toleration and liberty of worship was to be granted, compromises for the sake of peace could be permitted. The commonwealth of Israel had a unique form of government. It was a theocracy. God Himself

was the King, the Legislator, the Ruler Supreme, His Law the norm for all actions, for all judicial decisions. In this commonwealth, toleration of error was forbidden on penalty of death (Deut. 13:1–18; 18:20), even as false doctrine is forbidden upon pain of excommunication in the Church of the New Testament. And the doctrine which the apostles were preaching, for which they had been summoned before the Council by the high priest, did not concern some obscure point not clearly revealed, on which there might be a difference of opinion. It affected the very heart of the religion of Israel. Is Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah promised by God? That was the question at issue. This question was answered by the apostles with an unequivocal yes and by the Sadducees with just as decided a no. Gamaliel's advice was to be non-committal. If the apostles were right, then the Sadducees must accept Jesus as their Messiah or cease to be true Israelites. If the Sadducees were right, then the apostles must be put to death as dangerous perverters of the people. Gamaliel's advice was, Do nothing; bide your time; wait for results. This was not an issue on which there could be any reasonable doubt, in which the facts were hard to determine. The facts were clear; the facts were overwhelmingly proving the truth of the apostolic message. It was a fact that in the name of this Jesus that man lame from his mother's womb had been instantly healed (Acts 3:1–11; cp. 4:14–17) and that daily innumerable miracles were being performed in the very city of Jerusalem (Acts 2:43; 5:12–16). It was a fact that Jesus of Nazareth had fulfilled Scripture, as the apostles preached (2:16–36; 3:22–26; 4:10, 11). Not once do we hear of an effort on the part of the enemies to disprove the Scriptural arguments advanced by the apostles. Above all, it was a fact that Jesus of Nazareth had been crucified, dead, buried; they themselves had sealed the stone and set a watch to guard the grave. It was a fact that this selfsame Jesus had risen. The grave was empty. The enemies could not deny this fact. After their first attempt to discredit the resurrection by bribing the soldiers to spread a lie, not once did the enemies charge the apostles with preaching a falsehood. They simply forbade the preaching of the name of Jesus either without stating any reason or, in the only instance in which they gave a reason, they betrayed their evil conscience, their refusal to accept Jesus in spite of better knowledge by imputing to the apostles the intention of bringing this man's blood upon them, Acts 5:28. Peter was justified in charging them with rejecting not merely the well-established witness of the apostles but that of the Holy Ghost and with refusing to obey God, as else they would have received His gift, the Holy Ghost 5:32. And Gamaliel? He calmly tells his colleagues, Wait; lie low; stand by;

do not do anything. When the Pharisees approached Jesus with the request for a special sign, He answered: Matt. 12:39–42; cp. 16:1–4. What would Jesus have answered Gamaliel? We may read the answer Luke 11:23.

What a difference between the attitude of Gamaliel and that of the apostles! On the part of Peter and his fellow-apostles there is no equivocation, no halting between two opinions, no uncertainty, no waiting for more signs, no looking for success before one takes sides for or against Jesus. Listen to their clear-cut, courageous, positive statements, 2:14 ff.; 3:12 ff; 4:8–13. Every word breathes assurance, willingness to take the consequences of their testimony, be they what they may. What a refreshing contrast to the weak, vacillating policy of Gamaliel!

Gamaliel's advice under the circumstances that prevailed was also both illogical and at variance with the facts of history. It was an unwarranted generalization to base a general principle on two incidents, the more unwarranted since there are as many facts disproving his conclusion as affirming it. How often did the counsel of man succeed even if it ran counter to the will of God! Did Gamaliel never read Job 21:7–15; Jer. 12:1, 2; Ps. 73:3–12? Is Romanism of God or Freemasonry or Mohammedanism or Buddhism or sin or Satan? Have they not been eminently successful? Shall we wait until any one of them or all of them shall have been brought to naught before deciding against all or any of them? On the other hand, how often are the works of God destroyed by the wicked machinations of men and Satan! Where is the divinely created state of perfection? Where is Eden? Where is Jerusalem, the city of God? Where is the Temple, the house of Jehovah? Where is Israel, God's own chosen nation? Where are the churches of Asia Minor, of Northern Africa? Shall we wait until Christ shall have put down and utterly abolished all rule and all authority and power rising up against Him (1 Cor. 15:24; cp. Eph. 1:21) before deciding for Him? Will not the decision come too late? Will not Christ then tell us: Matt. 7:23? This life, today, this fleeting now, is the time for decision. Ten years hence, next year, tomorrow, may be too late. Procrastination is not only the thief of time, but it will steal things even more valuable than time; it will rob us of our Christ, our God, our salvation. In advocating suspension of judgment in this important matter, Gamaliel proved that his usually brilliant mind was blinded by Satan in matters pertaining to the way of life.

Gamaliel's advice did not remedy matters. It did not do justice to the apostles. Or was it right to mention them in the same line with such men as Theudas and Judas? It did not change the enmity of the Sadducees against the apostles. It rather hardened them in their unbelief. It did not benefit his own spiritual life, but

his refusal to take action for the apostles, his compromising attitude, led him deeper into sin, as we shall see.

By his diplomatic handling of a difficult situation, by his suave manner, by his tactful speech, Gamaliel succeeded in persuading the Sadducees to follow his advice. *And to him they agreed,* literally, were persuaded, listened to him, yielded to him. He had gained his point, at least as far as frustrating their determination to slay the apostles. Yet his victory was not a complete one. It was in the nature of a compromise. They were willing to let the prisoners go but not without some form of punishment because of their flagrant transgression of the commandment not to preach in the name of Jesus. Yet for the time being they were agreed on their mode of action. The danger of dissension and strife in the presence of the apostles having been eliminated, they called the apostles and beat them. The Jewish law forbade to give more than forty stripes with the lash or rod, Deut. 25:3. Fear to exceed this number caused them to cease at thirty-nine stripes, 2 Cor.11:24. The word translated "beat" is used of the slapping of Jesus by the servant of the high priest, of the beating Jesus suffered from the Roman soldiers, Luke 22:63. Paul uses the word to describe the punishment inflicted upon himself by the Philippian authorities, Acts 16:37 (cp. vv. 22, 23), and in 22:19 of his own maltreatment of the Christians; cp. 9:1; 26:11. It was a very painful form of punishment, and undoubtedly the literal meaning of the word, to flay, to skin, was often descriptive of what happened: the skin of the poor victim was broken and torn off in large portions.

Having wreaked their vengeance on the innocent, helpless prisoners, the Sadducees repeat their commandment that the apostles *should not speak in the name of Jesus.* Compare the similar prohibition in 4:17, 18. "In the name," ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, upon the authority of Jesus. Their opposition is directed against the authority of that Jesus of Nazareth whom they hated during His lifetime, whom they crucified, whose grave they sealed. Even though they cannot deny His resurrection, they would not have this Man to reign over them, Luke 19:14; 20:1–19. To this day one of the chief causes of enmity against Christ and His Gospel is the refusal to bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ (1 Cor. 10:5), the unwillingness of man to bow to a superior authority, to make Christ's Word the rule and norm of one's life. Reason, science, power, money, anything connected with man and his achievements, will be acknowledged as authorities, but Jesus? His Bible, that unscientific book? Never! Power may dictate, science may decree, money may command, and man will submit, but bow to Jesus? Where is His letter of authority? Who gave Him the right to rule over us? What has He to do with us and we with Him?

The Council finally *let them go,* set them free. To this extent Gamaliel's policy of moderation had prevailed. Yet the Sadducees had not given their consent to their liberation without having punished them severely and again forbidden them to preach in the name of Jesus. And Gamaliel? Unlike Nicodemus, John 7:50 ff., and Joseph, Luke 23:50 ff., he apparently connived at this injustice, consented to this procedure so utterly at variance with Jewish law, whether the apostles were guilty, Deut. 13, or innocent, Ex. 23:7; Ps. 94:20, 21. His was a sinful compromise, whereby he himself became guilty of that very sin against which he had warned his colleagues, of fighting against God. What success Gamaliel actually achieved in stopping the murder of the apostles, in persuading the Sadducees to a policy of moderation, was only temporary. Only a few months later Stephen breathed his last under the stones of the executioners, having been condemned to death by this same Council and its high priest, Acts 7. A persecution arose which scattered the Christian congregation, so that of all the many thousands of Christians only the apostles remained in Jerusalem, 8:1. And Saul was encouraged and supported in his mad ravings against the Christian congregation by the high priest, Acts 9:1, 2. Gamaliel's "success" was a short-lived one.

Yet the Lord of the Church used this man Gamaliel, to whom Christ Crucified was a stumbling-block and foolishness, to prevent the untimely murder of the apostles. Not yet were the witnesses of His resurrection to be killed. Not yet was the Church, still in its infancy, to be deprived of its infallible teachers and guides. Though the blood of Christians began to flow in the near future, yet it was not until about ten years later that James was to be beheaded as the first martyr among the apostles. The Lord rules in the midst of His enemies. Not only does He bring many of their schemes to naught, but He also so rules their wicked counsels that even they must work together for good to them whom He has chosen from eternity to be His own.

V. 41: *And they departed from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name.* "They departed" — the imperfect vividly presents the whole scene before our eyes. We see them setting out on their way, see them slowly passing by the members of the Council, their backs bruised and sore, their clothes soiled by the blood still oozing from the open wounds. Slowly, painfullly, they pass out of the presence of the Council. Yet their entire demeanor proves the injustice of comparing these men with such rebels and murderers as Theudas and Judas. They do not curse the Council; they do not heap maledictions upon their unjust, cruel judges. Nor do they stoically suffer their fate, silently submitting to something that can-

not be changed. Luke tells us that they departed rejoicing. The order of the words, "they now departed rejoicing from the presence of the Council," indicates that they did not wait with their rejoicing until they were at home and until they had their wounds dressed. No; in the presence of the Council, while they went forth, in the audience of their judges, they voiced their joy and exultation. Their departure was not the slinking away of criminals but a triumphant procession as of victors, as of people that have just been highly honored, decorated with badges of merit. They went forth "rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name." The purpose of the Council had been to dishonor, to shame them; they regarded this disgrace as an honorable distinction conferred upon them, every cut of the lash inflicted by their tormentors as a service-stripe granted to them by their heavenly King, every bruise a medal of honor; for did not their Savior tell them Matt. 5:11, 12? In obedience to His commandment and strengthened by His Spirit, they were able to rejoice where others would see occasion only for weeping and lamenting. Cp. Acts 16:25; Rom. 5:3.

The apostles went forth from the presence of the Council, the peace of God in their soul, songs of rejoicing upon their lips. They left behind a Council perplexed, beset by ever-increasing doubts "whereunto this would grow," v. 24, tormented by anxious forebodings, an unhappy company, because they had refused to accept the peace and joy prepared for them also by that selfsame Jesus of Nazareth whom the apostles preached, whom they, however, rejected. Cp. Is. 57:19–21.

V. 42: *And daily in the Temple and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.* "They ceased not." The imperfect again pictures to us the apostles as day by day they stopped not "being preaching ones and proclaiming as good news" Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah. Their teaching activity had been interrupted by their imprisonment, but no sooner had they been set free than their work of testifying of Jesus as the Christ continued. Twice they had been forbidden to speak in the authority of Christ, 4:18; 5:40, three times imprisoned, 4:3; 5:18, 26; they had been whipped. Yet in spite of it all they obeyed their Christ, their Lord and God, more than man. He had told them: Matt. 28:19; Acts 1:8; 5:19, 20. Who were men that they should forbid when God had commanded? In the Temple, where daily the multitudes came together, in the sight and in the hearing of their malicious enemies, they publicly proclaimed doctrines forbidden by the authorities of the Temple, because He who is more than the Temple, the true Lord of this house of God, had told them to be His witnesses. In every house, from house to house, they carried

the glad tidings of great joy entrusted to them and thus continued to fill Jerusalem with the Gospel, the savor of life unto life unto them that are saved, the savor of death unto death unto such as the Sadducees, such as would not believe. With such bold witnesses, is it surprising that the Church grew so rapidly? Here is one of the answers to the question, Why has the preaching of Christ Crucified seemingly lost its power in our day? Rom. 10:14, 15. We cannot refrain from quoting a paragraph from Lenski's homiletical hints on this Epistle: "What did the apostles do when they suffered such unjust and shameful treatment at the hands of the High Council? Did they call a great mass-meeting that very night of all the people and protest in the name of liberty, justice, and human rights against the treatment they had received, draw up a ringing appeal to Pontius Pilate for protection against any further violence of this kind and have it signed by thousands, and, to top it off, organize a society for the purpose of exposing to public criticism and scorn, injustice and wrong such as had been inflicted upon them? Hardly; the walls of Zion are not built by these modern methods of worldly procedure. The apostles joyfully preached the Gospel. That was their best answer to the stripes they had suffered." (Lenski, *Eisenach Epistle Selections,* II:52.)

As we are celebrating the centennial of the Saxon immigration, this text offers an opportunity to instruct the congregation on the nature of the work our Church is carrying on and the only God-pleasing manner in which this work is to be carried out. We have here a chapter from the history of the warfare between the powers of darkness and the King of Light. The theme: *The Raging of God's Enemies against His Church.* 1. Deep guile and great might are their dread arms in fight (Sadducees and Gamaliel). 2. The Word they still shall let remain. Christ holds the field forever. — *Christ Ruling His Church on Earth.* He stops the raving of the enemies; He enables His own to carry on His work. — *The Gospel of Christ Crucified Revealing the Thoughts of Many Hearts.* (Luke 2:35 may be used as introduction.) The thoughts of God's enemies (Sadducees, Gamaliel). The thoughts of God's children. — *How shall We Build the Church of God.* By willingly suffering persecution (not resisting force with force). By preaching the truth (not by compromises with error). — *No Neutrality or Compromise with Error in God's Church.* That is sinful. That is pernicious. (Always contrast the attitude of the apostles and of Gamaliel.) — *The Gospel Call for Decision.* 1. God's revelation is complete. 2. The lines among men are drawn. 3. Your time of grace is short. (Lenski, *Eisenach Epistle Selections,* II:73.)

TH. LAETSCH

Miscellanea

Does the First Part of This Story Repeat Itself Elsewhere?

Rev. W. Peck, S. T. D., relates this story in the *Living Church:* The new rector of a parish in a certain small English town was deeply troubled to find the congregation divided into two warring sections. He tried to discover what were the real issues and principles dividing them and came to the conclusion that there were none. What divided the church was the jealousy of the two leading families, the family of Alderman Bloggins and the family of Councilor Scroggins. [These are not the real names.] There were two camps. Anything proposed by a Blogginsite was at once ridiculed and opposed by the Scrogginsites. If the Scrogginsites produced a policy, the Blogginsites immediately provided the opposition. There was hatred between the two families. The rector saw them on Sundays, the alderman and the councilor looking thunderous and their wives exchanging glances full of lightning. And this went on until the rector's soul was seething within him, and he stood up in his pulpit and preached a sermon about it.

It was a terrific effort. Of course, he mentioned no names; but he simply let fly and lashed about him until his wife, sitting in the rectory pew, feared that the outraged tribes of Bloggins and Scroggins would unite in the slaughter of her too daring husband.

But nothing of the sort occurred. On the contrary, Alderman Bloggins met the rector on High Street on Monday morning and shook his hand warmly. "Rector," he said, "I want to thank you for that wonderful sermon. It was marvelous. I only hope it went home to the person for whom it was intended. It ought to do him a world of good." The rector was flabbergasted, and the alderman had gone before he could recover the power of speech. He went down High Street in a sort of dream, out of which he was awakened by the voice of Councilor Scroggins, who was standing at the door of his shop. "Rector," said the Councilor, "that was a magnificent sermon you preached yesterday. You gave it to him hot and strong. I hope he took it to heart."

The rector felt that earthquakes were occurring in his soul. He dared not trust himself to speak. He went home and told his wife about it. Half an hour later she said, "I've been thinking."

The following day the rector called upon Alderman Bloggins and raised the subject of church renovation. "How much do you suppose Scroggins will give?" asked the alderman. "I should think," said the rector, looking tremendously thoughtful, "about 20 pounds." "Paltry!" said the alderman. "I'll give you 50." "Thanks," said the rector and went off to Councilor Scroggins to raise with him the subject of church renovation. "How much do you suppose Bloggins will give?" asked the Councilor. "I think," said the rector, "that he will be good for 50 pounds." "Miserable!" said Scroggins. "I'll give you 100." "Thanks," said the rector and went back to Bloggins. "Scroggins," he announced, "is giving 100. I thought you would be glad to hear it." "Oh, indeed!" said

Bloggins. "Simply his confounded pride! But I'll teach him. I'll give you 150." "Thanks," said the rector and went back to Scroggins. "Bloggins," he said, "is giving 150. I thought you would like to know how well the fund is doing." "Just ostentation!" said Scroggins. "But we can't have him boasting about his generosity. I'll give you 200." And thus the strange competition continued throughout the week.

The following Sunday the rector, having preached about the importance of making friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness, invited Bloggins and Scroggins home to supper. It was a desperately brave deed. Each of the two men was absurdly embarrassed at the presence of the other. The rector and his wife seemed very cheerful, but the guests were dumb. They did not know that they were just about to get the shock of their lives. After supper the rector took them into his study and gave them chairs. Then, the light of battle in his eye, he opened fire upon them without warning.

"You two men," he said, "and your families have disgraced the church long enough with your jealousy and spite. You made the late rector's life a misery, and you have nearly driven me mad. But during the past week, for the sake of the hatred you bear each other, you have promised between you to contribute the sum of 700 pounds for the renovation of the church which you have defiled with your wretched feuds. I will accept your money upon one condition. You two sinners will shake hands here and now, and then you will kneel down and repeat together the General Confession. (You can do that without breaking the seal!) Then perhaps the renovation of the church will mean something. But, understand, I will not hear a word of self-defense from either of you." The clock in the rector's study ticked solemnly for some awful moments. Then Bloggins and Scroggins, both looking shy and rather absurd, stood up and shook hands. Then they dutifully knelt down and said with the rector the General Confession; and the rector pronounced absolution. They rose from their knees and carefully dusted their trousers. "That is splendid!" said the rector. "And now you must go and tell the good news to your wives." E.

Argument against the Individual Communion Cup from the Ex Autou

It has been asked whether the argument against the individual Communion cup from Christ's command "Drink ye all *of it*" (Matt. 26:27: "*Piete* EX AUTOU *pantes*"; Mark 14:23: "*Epion* EX AUTOU *pantes*") is valid. The argument from the *ex autou* may in substance be stated as follows: "The expression *ex autou* means: 'Drink ye of *the same cup.*' In these words therefore our Savior commands the use of *one and the same* cup, so that the use of the individual cup at the celebration of the Lord's Supper is *directly anti-Scriptural.*" In discussing this timely topic, we should like to stress the following points:

1. In our literature the right of a church to use the individual cup has been defended. Dean Fritz, for example, in his excellent *Pastoral Theology,* writes with regard to the use of the individual cup as follows (p. 149): "There is no dogmatical reason why the individual Communion cup should not be used. In many churches two cups are used; why

not more? But there is also no good reason why the old practise of using the common Communion cup should be discontinued. Sanitary reasons do not absolutely forbid it; the danger of infection is very remote." 2. No exegete of recognized ability and trustworthiness has ever drawn the conclusion from the *ex autou* which some contenders actually have drawn. Their interpretation is an exegetical anomaly, violating all sound hermeneutical canons governing Scriptural exegesis. 3. The meaning of the *ex autou* is not: "Drink ye out of *the same cup*" but, as our Authorized Version, and every other correct translation for all that (cf. Luther's "Trinket alle *daraus*"), reads: "*of it.*" In other words, there is no special emphasis on the *ex autou*, as if the expression meant to say: "Drink ye all of this *one and the same* cup." Those who interpret the words thus commit the offense of *eisegesis*, or of misused explanation, which forces upon the text what the text itself does not say. "Of the same [cup]" would require *ek* TOU *autou*. 4. The fact that Christ here speaks in the singular: "Drink ye all *of it*," does not argue for the use of *one common* Communion cup, since, as the context shows, the singular *autou* is required by the singular *potaerion*, immediately preceding. In view of the singular *potaerion* Christ simply could not have said "*ex autoon*" unless He wanted to violate the genius of Greek language. 5. If the *ex autou* must be taken in a bare, literal sense, then our Lutheran churches erred in using two or more larger Communion cups at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Yet this custom has been quite generally observed and acknowledged as correct in our Church. 6. If the *ex autou* must be taken in a bare, literal sense, then, moreover, all communicants till the end of time must use the *original cup* which Christ used at the first Communion; for if the *ex autou* is *demonstrative and exclusive*, then we are compelled to go back to the same cup which Christ had in His hand when He spoke the words of institution. 7. If bare literalness in this case is to apply, then, further, we have no assurance that we are right in using Communion *wafers (Hostien)*, since Christ says: "Take, eat; this *(touto)* is My body." The *touto* is as singular as is the *ex autou*, and if the latter compels us to use but *one cup*, then the former must equally force us to use but *one bread*, especially since St. Paul, in 1 Cor. 10:17, emphasizes the *one* bread as symbolizing the unity of the body of believers. He says: "For *one* bread *(heis artos), one body (hen sooma)* we, the many, are; for we all partake of the *one* bread *(ek tou henos artou).*" This the *Weimar Bible* explains in its simple but excellent way: "Also auch wir Christen, die wir von *einem* Brot im heiligen Abendmahl essen und von *einem* Kelch trinken, werden dadurch *ein* Leib und machen *eine* Kirche, *eine* Gemeinde." That is to say: "So also we Christians, who in the Lord's Supper eat of *one* bread and drink of *one* cup, thereby become *one* body and constitute *one* Church, *one* congregation." But if the use of the *many wafers* does not destroy the symbolized Communion unity, then neither is it necessary to retain the *one* Communion cup. The parallelism here is complete, and what holds of the *one* bread holds also of the *one* cup. In short, the argument from the *ex autou* attempts to prove too much and therefore proves nothing, while it creates immense exegetic and dogmatic difficulties.

When we say all this, we do not mean to urge the use of the indi-

vidual cup. Whether a congregation wishes to do so or not depends on its own decision; for also with regard to this adiaphoron it may exercise its Christian liberty, provided no offense is given. Personally, for many reasons, we prefer the common Communion cup. However, as we must attack every attempt to say *less* than Holy Scripture does, so also we must combat every attempt to say *more* than Holy Scripture does. In other words, it is offensive and unchristian to make that a wrong which Scripture itself does not declare to be wrong. The principle of Christian liberty must never be violated. J. T. M.

Vom Kanzelton

In den „Paſtoralblättern" (Herausgeber D. Erich Stange; Verlag: C. Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden-Leipzig), und zwar in dem Februarheft für 1938, findet ſich ein lehrreicher Artikel über den Kanzelton. Die Hauptabſchnitte drucken wir hier ab. Der Verfaſſer, D. E. Haack, ſchreibt:

Der Kanzelton iſt leider häufig genug zu finden, wie jeder weiß, der, wie der Verfaſſer, jahrzehntelang ein Predigerſeminar geleitet oder viele Predigten und Prediger gehört hat. Er erklingt in den allermannigfachſten, ſchwer aufzuzählenden und zu beſchreibenden Variationen. Es iſt ergötzlich, zu leſen, wie Spurgeon, „der König der Prediger", in ſeinen intereſſanten „Vorleſungen in meinem Predigerſeminar" den Kanzelton der hochkirchlichen Geiſtlichkeit Englands ſchildert und verſpottet, wie er in allen möglichen Abwandlungen, „vom Tſchiep! Tſchiep! des Buchfinken bis zum Brüllen der Rinder Baſans", zu hören iſt. Sein Spott trifft auch manchen Prediger in Deutſchland. Der eine meint, ohne Rückſichtnahme auf Ort und Raumverhältniſſe, ſtets alle Regiſter ſeines Stimmorgans bis zur höchſten Lautgrenze ziehen zu müſſen, und quält und ermüdet ſo Ohren und Herzen der Zuhörer. Ein anderer hält es mit einem übertriebenen Modulieren durch alle Stufen der Dynamik hindurch vom fortissimo bis zum flüſternden piano und Verſchlucken der Endſilben und erſchwert ſo ſchon das äußere Verſtändnis ſeiner Rede ſeitens der zuhörenden Gemeinde. Wieder ein anderer hat ſich eine gemachte Salbung angewöhnt oder hält ein dröhnendes Pathos für den angemeſſenen Ausdruck chriſtlicher Glaubensfeſtigkeit und Parrheſie der Rede und erweckt ſo den Schein der Unechtheit. Dagegen ſpricht ein anderer monoton und lieſt, wie der Protokollführer ſein Protokoll, die auswendig gelernte Predigt von dem ins Gedächtnis aufgenommenen Konzept ab. Ein fünfter ſpricht zwar nicht monoton, aber „iſoton", in denſelben Hebungen und Senkungen in den einzelnen Perioden und Sätzen, oft unter Begleitung derſelben Geſten. Dieſer liebt das langſame, feierliche Tempo eines Trauermarſches und jener das Allegro oder gar Preſto in einer Symphonie. Wie ein ſchäumender Gießbach rauſcht ſeine Rede über die Köpfe ſeiner Zuhörer dahin. Wer vermag alle die verſchiedenen Variationen des Kanzeltons aufzuzählen? Das Gemeinſame bei allen aber iſt die größere oder geringere Unnatur, die ihre Stimme auf der Kanzel annimmt im Unterſchied von ihrer gewöhnlichen Sprechweiſe und dem ihnen eigentlich natürlichen Gebrauch und Klang ihrer Stimme.

Man nehme dieſe und andere in dem Wort „Kanzelton" zuſammengefaßten Fehler des Predigtvortrags nicht zu leicht. Gewiß, manche Gemeinde, beſonders auf dem Lande, hat ſich ſo an den Kanzelton ihres Paſtors gewöhnt, daß ſie ſich nicht daran ſtößt, wenn er ſonſt nur ein treuer Seel-

sorger ist. Die eindrucksvolle, christliche Persönlichkeit und die sonstige Amtsführung des Pfarrers kann ihn [den Kanzelton] unschädlich machen. Aus meinem sechzig Jahre zurückliegenden Universitätsstudium in einer Großstadt erinnere ich mich noch heute, daß eine längst heimgegangene, geweihte Predigerpersönlichkeit trotz ihres wenig wohllautenden Stimmorgans und mangelhaften Vortrags durch den tiefen, reichen Inhalt ihrer Predigten sonntäglich gerade geförderte Christen, die „mit Ernst Christen sein" und „mehr haben wollten", auch aus andern Gemeinden in seine Kirche zog. Wiederum wirkte gleichzeitig ein anderer Geistlicher durch den lebendigen, natürlichen Vortrag seiner gläubigen Predigten bei bilderreicher, konkreter Sprache mehr auf die große Menge; und auch Fernerstehende halfen stets die große Kirche bis auf den letzten Platz füllen. Und das möchte doch jeder Prediger des göttlichen Wortes. . . .

Der Grundschade des Kanzeltons und die Ursache seiner unerfreulichen Wirkungen ist eben die Unnatur, die ihm anhaftet, daß der Pastor auf der Kanzel anders spricht, als man sonst bei ihm gewohnt ist. Das erweckt den üblen Anschein, als sei das Gesagte bei ihm nicht echt, nicht seine innerste Überzeugung, für die er mit seiner ganzen Persönlichkeit eintritt. Mag es auch nicht so sein, sondern nur so scheinen; aber man urteilt nach diesem Schein, wenn man den Redner nicht genauer kennt, besonders feiner organisierte Zuhörer mit gebildeterem Geschmack und in unserer Zeit mit ihrem nüchternen Wirklichkeitssinn. Aber auch ein einfacher Bauer klagte mir einmal über die Sprechweise seines Pastors: „Hei vertellt sich dat all sülben."

Wie kommt es nun zu diesem Fehler? Manche neigen von Natur zu ihm, ohne daß sie es wissen und wollen. Ihre Stimme und Sprache nimmt, wie von selber, einen andern Ton an, wenn sie öffentlich und in dem sakralen Raum der Kirche sprechen sollen. Die erwartungsvoll auf sie gerichteten Augen einer größeren Versammlung, die Feierlichkeit des Gottesdienstes, oft auch Äußerlichkeiten wie die zu große Höhe der Kanzel, die den inneren Kontakt mit der Gemeinde erschwert, auch wohl die sonst nicht gewohnte Amtstracht machen sie befangen, reizen zu besonderen Stimmanövern und machen ihre Rede unnatürlich und manieriert, und diese Manier wird dann mehr und mehr zur Angewohnheit, die leider die Eigentümlichkeit hat, sich festzusetzen und zu wachsen, wenn sie nicht von vornherein eine verständnisvolle Kritik findet. Da heißt es: **„Principiis obsta; sero medicina paratur."** . . .

Kritik ist freilich kein Heilmittel. Was gibt es denn für Mittel zur Bekämpfung und Überwindung des fehlerhaften Kanzeltons? Ein doppeltes: ein physiologisches und ein psychologisches. Das physiologische ist ein sachverständiger Sprech- (nicht Sprach-)unterricht. Selbststudium der Phonetik nach einem Buch ist wenig ratsam und wenig Erfolg versprechend. Einerseits ist es zu langweilig. Man ermüdet dabei. Andererseits fehlt dabei das Vorbild für die rechte Lautbildung und die sachverständige Beurteilung der eigenen Übungen darin durch einen andern. Das psychologische Mittel besteht in dem rechten Amtsbewußtsein und der lebendigen Vergegenwärtigung der Forderung des Amtes, der Situation und der Stunde, daß der Prediger sich sagt: Du bist auf der Kanzel kein Redner, der es auf Effekt anlegt und um Beifall wirbt; kein Rezitator, der durch seine Deklamation Eindruck machen will; kein Handwerker, der geschäftsmäßig eine Facharbeit leistet. Du bist der verantwortliche Hirte und Seelsorger der Gemeinde, der sie zu Gott führen und sie auf den Grund- und Eckstein ihres Glaubens

„erbauen, zubereiten, stärken, kräftigen, gründen" soll, 1 Petr. 5, 10, und um ihre Seelen wirbt, wie der Brautwerber, der **philos tou nymphiou**, Joh. 3, 29. Du bist Botschafter an Christi Statt, der einfach und einfältig die Botschaft ausrichtet, zu der er gesandt wird, 2 Kor. 5, 19—22. Du sollst ein Zeuge JEsu Christi sein, der von ihm zeugt, Joh. 15, 26, und bezeugt, was er gesehen und beschaut und betastet hat vom Wort des Lebens, 1 Joh. 1, 1, und der sein Zeugnis nur verdächtig macht, wenn er gekünstelt und unnatürlich spricht. Das hilft gegen den Kanzelton und verhilft zu dem rechten, warmen Herzenston, der von Herzen kommt und zu Herzen geht. A.

The Pledge of Princeton Seminary Professors

Members of the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary take the following pledge when entering upon their office: "In the presence of God and of the trustees of this seminary I do solemnly and *ex animo* adopt, receive, and subscribe the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church of the United States in America as the confession of my faith or as a summary and just exhibition of that system of doctrine and religious belief which is contained in Holy Scripture and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation; and I do solemnly, *ex animo*, profess to receive the form of government of said Church as agreeable to the inspired Oracles. And I do solemnly promise and engage not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate anything which shall appear to me to contradict or contravene, either directly or impliedly, anything taught in the said Confession of Faith or Catechisms nor to oppose any of the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government while I shall continue a professor in this seminary." (Cf. *Presbyterian* of December 2, 1937.) A.

Can a Christian be Lost?

A pamphlet bearing this title has so perplexed one of our readers that he submitted it to us for discussion and criticism. What the pamphlet means to defend is of course the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute perseverance, stated by the author in his *Introduction* in the words: "We come in contact with scores of persons who condemn us whole-heartedly when we mention the *eternal security of the 'born-again' one.*" (Italics our own.) What the brochure champions is the old Reformed doctrine that a person once brought to faith can never lose it again. Dr. F. Bente, in his "Historical Introduction to the Symbolical Books" (*Triglot*, p. 200), quotes the Calvinist Jerome Zanchi as having expressed himself on this error as follows: "1. To the elect in this world faith is given by God *only once*. 2. The elect who have once been endowed with true faith . . . can *never again lose faith altogether*. 3. The elect never sin with their whole mind or their entire will. 4. When Peter denied Christ, he indeed lacked the *confession* of the mouth, but not the *faith of the heart.*" This false Calvinistic doctrine of the absolute perseverance of the "born-again" person is as far removed from the Lutheran doctrine of God's gracious Gospel assurance of preserving the believer in faith as is the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination from the Lutheran doctrine of election *in Christ*. In both cases it is the element of *absoluteness* which makes the distinction. We Lutherans do not teach an absolute pre-

destination; neither do we teach an absolute perseverance. It is significant how strenuously Lutheran teachers, even in their *quasi*-popular theological works, opposed this dangerous Reformed error. Conrad Dieterich, for example, in his *Institutiones Catecheticae* (pp. 417 sqq.; translation by Dr. Notz, pp. 358 ff.), quite exhausts the subject, though his *Catechetical Instruction* was intended only for young men in secondary schools of learning. On the one hand, he at great length proves the Scriptural doctrine from clear Bible-passages, and, on the other, he refutes the Calivinistic argumentation, pointing out that the passages which the Calvinists quote for their doctrine (*e. g.*, Ps. 51:12, 13; 111:3 b; Hos. 2:19; Matt. 24:24; John 10:28; 13:1; 14:16; Rom. 11:29; 1 John 3:9, 10; Jude 3) simply do not prove that "faith once bestowed can never again be lost." On the contrary, many clear and unmistakable passages declare that the believer can lose his faith (*e. g.*, Matt. 24:12, 13; Luke 8:13; Rom. 8:13; 1 Tim. 1:5, 6; 1:19; 1 John 2:9; 3:15; 1 Sam. 16:14 [Saul]; 2 Sam. 12 [David]; 1 Kings 11:15, cf. with 3:3; 8:15 [Solomon]; Ex. 32:1 ff. [Aaron]; Matt. 26:69, cf. with 16:17 [Peter]; John 20:21 [Thomas]; Gal. 5:4 [the Galatian apostates]; 1 Tim. 1:19; 2 Tim. 2:17; 4:10 [Alexander, Hymenaeus, Philetus, Demas]; etc.). That, of course, the *elect* will not be lost but will be eternally saved, is a truth which Scripture teaches very clearly (John 10:29; Matt. 24:24; etc.). But that is something entirely different from the Reformed doctrine that a Christian cannot again lose his faith. Christians, or believers, certainly can lose their faith, though by God's grace the elect, in case they fall, will be restored to faith and thus finally be saved.

The great trouble with the Calvinists is that, as in other places, so also here they fail to observe the basic difference between the Law and the Gospel and thus mingle the two into each other, thereby producing a *mixtum compositum* which is neither Christian nor comforting. Lutherans, on the other hand, also here rightly distinguish between Law and Gospel; and at the same time they take all Law statements and all Gospel statements at their full face value. When thus Scripture warns the believer against losing his faith through carnal indifference and contempt for God's Word (Matt. 24:12, 13; Luke 8:13; Rom. 8:13; 1 Cor. 10:12; etc.), they take this as *Law-preaching*, addressed to the evil flesh of the Christian, and indeed as a very necessary and real warning, which all Christians must impress upon their Old Adam and which especially the carnally secure must hear and heed. These warnings must not be interpreted to mean that *on God's part* the believer's salvation is uncertain and that therefore he dare not rejoice in the assurance of his salvation (so Romanists and all Pelagianizers); but they do mean that, if believers sow to their flesh, they shall also of the flesh reap corruption. (Cf. Gal. 6:8.) On the other hand, when Scripture comforts the believer with the assurance that the elect will not be lost, that God is faithful to continue the good work which He has begun in the believers (Matt. 24:24; John 10:27, 28; Phil. 1:6; 1 Cor. 10:13; 1:8, 9), this is precious Gospel comfort, which must not be wickedly abused in the interest of carnal security, since it is meant for the believer only inasmuch as he is a new man and continues in true faith in Christ. We proceed rightly and Scripturally only if we always view our election and salvation in Christ;

for the certainty of our salvation must not be determined from the Law or from feeling or from appearance (as the Formula of Concord so earnestly warns us), but from Christ's serious and universal Gospel-promises, upon which we rest our hope of eternal life. The believer, holding to Christ in true faith, should rejoice in his salvation; but if he turns away from Christ to the Law or to works or to anything else, he must not falsely comfort himself with any supposed absolute election assurance suggested to him by his feeling or inward conviction but must realize that, since he rejects Christ, he rejects also His salvation and is therefore lost, unless, of course, he returns to Christ in true repentance.

That, in the briefest form, is the Scriptural doctrine on this point, and we pastors must consider it again and again and, besides, carefully inculcate it upon our hearers, since today so many Reformed enthusiasts falsely seek to console men with the erroneous notion that, "once a believer, always a believer." J. T. M.

Der Tag der Kreuzigung JEſu julianiſch datiert

Laktanz (geſt. um 330) ſchreibt hierüber in ſeiner Schrift *De Mortibus Persecutorum* zu Anfang des 2. Kapitels: „In den letzten Zeiten [des 15. Jahres] des Kaiſers Tiberius iſt, wie wir geſchrieben leſen, unſer HErr JEſus Chriſtus von den Juden gekreuzigt worden am 10. nach den Kalenden des April (am 10. April), als die beiden Gemini Konſuln waren." Die Klauſel „wie wir geſchrieben leſen" verrät Quellenſtudien, die Laktanz wahrſcheinlich wegen der Oſterſtreitigkeiten machte, und ſichert ſeiner Angabe möglichſte Korrektheit. Doch dies ſein Datum kann nur durch die Sonntagsbuchſtabenmethode beſtätigt werden, wonach die Buchſtaben G bis A zu den Wochentagen geſetzt wurden: beſtändig G zu Sonntag, F zu Montag, A zu Samstag.

In Paulys' „Real-Enzyklopädie", VII, 2573, ſteht: „Auf dem als Fasti Sabini bezeichneten Kalenderfragment aus der Zeit des Auguſtus (CIL I², 220) werden Reihen von ſieben Buchſtaben (G—A) zur Bezeichnung der ſiebentägigen Woche geſetzt." Mit der Zeit wurden ſie Sonntagsbuchſtaben genannt. Ihre Bedeutung iſt, daß der Buchſtabe, der beim 7. Januar[1]) ſteht, die Tage des Jahres ſo regiert, daß man die Wochentage findet. Es führte das auch zum 28jährigen Sonnenzirkel, der mit einem Schaltjahr, wozu zwei Buchſtaben gehören, alſo mit GF 1, beginnt und mit A 28 ſchließt. „Nach Verlauf ſolcher 28 Jahre fallen die Wochentage wieder auf dasſelbe Datum." (Meyer, Hand-Lexikon.)

Dieſe Kalendermethode iſt ſeit den Tagen des Auguſtus bis heute korrekt befolgt worden. Irgendeine Unregelmäßigkeit während des Verlaufs eines Jahres ändert jedoch ſofort die Reihenfolge der Buchſtaben. So war vom 1. Januar bis zum 4. Oktober 1582 G 23 der Sonntagsbuchſtabe. Nun fiel auf Verordnung Gregors XIII. hin der 5.—14. Oktober aus, ſo daß vom 15. Oktober an C 15 der Buchſtabe war. Vom 4. Oktober 1582 aufwärts bis zum 25. Juli 325 findet ſich keine Unregelmäßigkeit in der Abfolge des Son-

1) „Der 7. des 1. Monats hat von alters her im religiöſen und praktiſchen Leben eine Rolle geſpielt." (Paulys, a. a. O., S. 2579.) Der 7. Januar war nach römiſcher Anſchauung in der erſten Woche des neuen Jahres der erſte Tag desſelben, da ſie die Kalenderzeit rückläufig beſtimmten: von Kalenden, Nonen, Iden aufwärts.

nenzirkels. Sonntag, den 25. Juli 325, feierte Konstantin die zwanzigste Jährung seiner Thronbesteigung.

Eusebius teilt in seiner Schrift ***De Martyribus Palaestinae*** als Augenzeuge der Diokletianischen Verfolgung etliche Märtyrertage samt den Wochentagsbezeichnungen mit, so Kap. VII: „Am 2. April 307, am Ostersonntag, wurde die noch keine achtzehn Jahre alte Theodosia schrecklich gemartert und schließlich im Meer ertränkt." Nach dem 2. April 307 bis zum Sonntag, 25. Juli 325, vergingen dem Kalender nach 6,689 Tage. Wird die Summe durch 7 dividiert, sollte der Quotient eine restlose Zahl sein; aber die Antwort ist 955, R. 4.

Nun ist bekannt, daß im Jahre des Nizäischen Konzils das Datum der Frühjahrs-Tag- und Nachtgleiche (Äquinoktium) aus dem 25. März, der bisher dafür galt, in das richtigere Datum, nämlich den 21. März, verändert wurde. Das konnte jedoch nur durch Eliminierung von vier Tagen aus der Kalenderzeit dieses Jahres geschehen, wie im Kalender des Jahres 1582 von Gregor zehn Tage gestrichen wurden. Auch wurde bekanntlich zu Nizäa der erste Sonntag nach dem ersten Vollmond im Frühjahr als Osterzeit geordnet. Die Audianer machten diese Änderung nicht mit und beschuldigten etwa vierzig Jahre später die Orthodoxen, sie hätten sich einer Gefälligkeit (prosopolepsia) gegen den weltlichen Kaiser schuldig gemacht; „denn", sagten sie, „als die Feierlichkeit des Konstantin statthatte, ändertet ihr die Osterfeier". (Epiphanius, ***Adv. Haereses***, **I, 821. A. Audiani, IX; cf. 826, XIV.**) Das weist deutlich darauf hin, daß die vier Tage just vor Konstantins zwanzigster Jahresfeier seiner Thronbesteigung aus dem Kalender gestrichen wurden, also der 21. bis 24. Juli, so daß diese Feier anstatt am Donnerstag am vorhergehenden Sonntag vor sich ging. Das änderte nun auch die Reihenfolge der Sonntagsbuchstaben aus **C** 26 in **F** 18 für die Tage vom 1. Januar bis zum 20. Juli; denn da der 20. Juli auf einen Samstag fiel, war für die Zeit von da aufwärts bis zum 1. Januar **F** 18 Sonntagsbuchstabe.

Wird nun von **F** 18 für die erste Hälfte des Jahres 325 der Sonnenzirkel bis ins Jahr 30 verfolgt, das Dionysius richtig als das Jahr der Kreuzigung JEsu festlegte, so wird **D** 3 für dies Jahr 30 als Sonntagsbuchstabe gefunden. Unter **D** 3 aber fällt der 7. Januar auf Mittwoch und dementsprechend der 10. April auf Freitag. Somit haben die Quellenstudien des Laktanz das richtige damalige julianische Datum für den Tag der Kreuzigung JEsu erforscht.[2] W. G.

Table-Prayer of Oxford Students in Christ College Dining-Hall (built under Cardinal Wolsey)

Nos, miseri homines et egeni, pro cibis, quos nobis ad corporis subsidium benigne es largitus, tibi, Deus omnipotens, Pater Coelestis, gratias reverenter agimus, simul obsecrantes ut iis sobrie, modeste atque grate utamur, per Iesum Christum, Dominum nostrum. Amen. M. S. S.

---

2) Nach der Sonntagsbuchstabenliste ordnet sich denn auch der Märtyrertag des Polykarp, „133 Jahre nach Christi Kreuzigung"; **cf. *Chronikon Paschale***, auf Samstag (Sabbatum Magnum), 23. Februar 163, unter dem Buchstaben **F** 24. Der Märtyrertag des Ignatius hinwiederum fiel in das Schaltjahr 108 unter den Buchstaben **ED** 25 auf Sonntag, 20. Dezember. Diese beiden Daten hat die griechische Kirche als die Gedenktage dieser Märtyrer in ihrem Kalender aufbehalten.

Evolution Opposed

In a very informing article appearing in the *Presbyterian* for March 10, 1938, W. Bell Dawson, M. A., D. Sc., F. R. C. S., presents some arguments which show how untenable even from the point of view of the scientist the theory of evolution, when closely scrutinized, proves to be. Discussing plants and trees, he says, among other things:

"We see also in the world a wonderful variety of vegetation. There are humble kinds of mosses and ferns which have no flowers; there are pine-trees and spruces which do not bear any nuts or fruits; and there are fruit-trees and plants with their seeds inside their fruit, as currants and apples have. So, when we look over all the different plants and vegetables and trees, what comes out most clearly is the contrast between the different kinds. Ferns have spores, almost like dust, instead of seeds. Some trees, such as the palm, have stems that are strengthened inwardly, whereas the birch and the maple add layers of wood to the outside of their trunks as they grow taller. The leaves of the pine and the oak and the way their seeds are formed, could hardly be more different. Everywhere we look we see opposites and no connecting links. How, then, can we suppose that one kind of plant developed from another? The great vegetable world of plants and trees is an immense puzzle to the evolutionists; and in consequence very few botanists who study these things believe in evolution."

In another section, speaking of the world of minute things, consisting of only one cell, he says:

"First of all, is it certain that these are the primary living things and the earliest in the world? In reality there are very large groups of one-celled creatures which can only live with the help of what is more advanced than themselves. Some are helpful to plants and live on their roots (enabling plants to assimilate nitrogen). Then the molds and other scavengers live on decaying matter. Many others live within the bodies of insects or animals; and some kinds get their nourishment from these animals, while others help them to digest their food. Others again cause diseases. It is plain that none of these kinds could have existed before there were well-developed plants and high animals in the world. These minute creatures thus serve definite purposes in nature. It may possibly be that the Creator made them in different ages, as they were needed. Can we say that the divine intelligence in creating a tiny creature or the power of God to make it live, is less than for some larger animal?

"We next ask: If these one-celled things can change so easily into better creatures, as the evolutionists say, why is it that they have not done so long ago? How does it happen that there are such multitudes and such varieties of them still in the world? Then again, if we are trying to see whether each seed that grows and each animal that is born is a little better than its father or its parent plant, we would have to watch a very long time to see any change. For seeds take a year to grow, and most animals and birds have young ones only once a year. But there are these tiny one-celled things which multiply so fast that it is possible for their numbers to double every half hour. There are as

many generations among them in three weeks as sheep or birds have in a thousand years. So here surely is a splendid chance to see if creatures change, and if anything does, those lowly and simple things should do so.

"Among them all, the disease germs have probably been the most carefully studied. Yet, if there was any change at all, this study would be quite useless, because from one year to another a typhoid germ might turn into a malaria germ. There would thus be no certain way of telling one disease from another. One year for these germs is the same as 175 centuries in producing breeds of cattle. So it is really very wonderful that they show no change whatever. How can the evolutionist explain this?

"It may seem strange to ask whether we can always tell a plant from an animal; but when we come down to creatures which have only one cell for their whole body, it may not be so easy. Yet it is important, for the evolutionist has to prove that plants turned into animals or at least that they were both the same at first, or he must give up his theory of evolution.

"The distinction between plant and animal that is most readily seen is shown by the two different ways in which they nourish themselves. A plant can get all that it needs to live upon from the air and water and the ground. It takes the gases in the air and the salts dissolved in water or in the earth and manufactures these into starch and sugar and even higher products. No animal can do this, for it cannot live directly on the air and water and earth. An animal must have for its food the things which plants have already prepared; and if it eats milk and eggs or even meat, these have already been produced by other animals from the vegetations which they fed upon.

"We may sum it all up by saying that plants make food and animals use it up. This is strictly correct; and the use to which the animal puts this food is just the opposite of what the plant has done. We could make this very plain if we could go into the chemistry of it all; but we will just give one sentence of this: *Plants produce starches and albumins directly from inorganic substances by deoxidizing them and thus obtain their heat and muscular energy.* This shows the gap which there is between vegetable and animal life, which on the whole are just the opposite of each other." A.

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

Is the Bible the Word of God? — A manifesto issued by the Catholic Advisory Council (an Anglo-Catholic federation) against the *Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine* (appointed by the archbishops of Canterbury and York) states in paragraph 2: "The Church of England has ever professed a profound reverence for the Bible as the written Word of God, divinely inspired and authoritatively recognized as such by the Church. The current easy rejection by some accredited teachers of plain testimonies of Holy Scripture — *e. g.*, to the occurrence of miracles, the existence of an order of spiritual beings, both good and evil, and the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent — is clearly inconsistent with that Scriptural and historic Christianity to which the Church of England is irrevocably committed." Paragraph 3 points out that the Church of England "requires all priests at their ordination to promise that they will be 'ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines *contrary to God's Word*' and requires all bishops to renew this vow at their consecration." (Book of Common Prayer, on the Ordering of Priests: "Are you persuaded that *the Holy Scriptures* contain all doctrine required as necessary for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?" "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to *God's Word*?" Articles of Religion, Art. VI: "*Holy Scripture* containeth all things necessary to salvation." Art. XXXIV: "Traditions and ceremonies may be changed ..., so that nothing be ordained against *God's Word*.") The editor of the *Living Church* (May 4, 1938) states: "It is only fair to say, however, that there are undoubtedly many Anglo-Catholics both in England and in this country who would not fully endorse every statement made in the Anglo-Catholic manifesto. For our own part we find ourselves perhaps 95 per cent. in agreement with the manifesto, which we gladly hail as a timely and important document." He mentions and discusses several paragraphs with which he is in agreement. But he does not list paragraphs 2 and 3 among them. In fact, he refers to the six articles published in the February and March issues, covering the *Report of the Commission*, the concluding article of which series states: "The significance of this section of the *Report* lies chiefly in its bearing upon homiletics. As 'the method of direct appeal to isolated texts' is so evidently liable to error, it is to be expected that preaching from isolated texts will gradually give place to genuine expository preaching in which the Word of God *contained*" (italics in original) "in the Scripture will be sought, studied in all the light that modern scholarship affords, and then applied to problems of the modern world. . . . In forceful terms the Commission states its conviction that 'the authority of the Bible must not be interpreted as prejudging conclusions of historical, critical, and scientific investigation in any field.'" Paragraph 2 is one of the parts of the manifesto with which the *Living Church* does not agree.

The historical and scientific mistakes of the Bible do not permit the identification of Scripture with the Word of God. The best one can do is to say that the Scriptures contain the Word of God. We, on our part, are glad to note that the manifesto, wrong in many instances, upholds the old Christian teaching that "the Bible is the written Word of God, divinely inspired."

A similar pronouncement is made by the *Allg. E.-L. Kz.* (March 11, 1938), and we are glad to take note of it. "Die lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften sind sich uebereinstimmend darueber klar, dass letzte Quelle und Autoritaet alles Wissens um Gott das Wort Gottes ist. Unter ausdruecklicher Berufung auf Luther stellt daher die F. C. in der Solida Declaratio von dem summarischen Begriff fest, 'dass alleine Gottes Wort die einzige Richtschnur und Regel aller Lehre sein und bleiben solle.' Dieses Wort Gottes ist fuer das lutherische Bekenntnis in der Heiligen Schrift, oder wie es an andern Stellen heisst, in den prophetischen und apostolischen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testamentes, 'dem reinen und lauteren Brunnen Israels' enthalten." And the writer does not mean that the Word of God is *contained* in the Scriptures. For later on he uses the phrase: "Das in die Bibel gefasste Wort Gottes." And again: "Aus den Worten der Bibel stroemt uns der Heilige Geist entgegen."

It is well to take note of such testimonies as these. The conditions which evoked the protest of the Catholic Advisory Council confront us, too; we, too, need to protest against the voices heard within the Lutheran Church of America, discrediting the Bible as the very Word of God, divinely inspired. We dare not keep silence when accredited teachers of the Church write a New Testament commentary incorporating the liberal view of the miracles. We protest against the un-Lutheran, unscriptural thesis proposed and defended at the Washington Debate by a spokesman for the United Lutheran Church: "As one writer on this question says: 'It [the Bible] has carried with it the husk as well as the kernel,' and in illustration of his meaning he quotes some stories of vengeance, cruelty, *lex talionis*, polygamy, adultery, which he relates." (See CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., p. 359. — Dr. Snyder is quoting Dr. Alleman. See *Luth. Church Quart.*, July, 1936, p. 240.) Dr. Alleman tells us: "The Bible contains the Word of God. It is the rule of our faith because it enshrines the Word." (*Luth. Church Quart.*, l. c.) Our Confessions declare: The Bible is the Word of God. They identify Scripture and God's Word: "Die Schrift und Gottes Wort." "To teach men *Scripture* and that those admonished by the *Word*" (Apology, Art. 24, § 3). Men do not speak the Lutheran language who cannot state definitely, The Bible is the Word of God, but when they try to say it, stammer all sorts of restrictions and reservations: "The Bible, then, is the Word of God not because of any theoretical explanation of the method of divine inspiration, but because as one connected, harmonious, authentic, recorded whole, from beginning to end, the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are 'they which testify of Christ.'" (Dr. G. Drach, in *Luth. Church Quart.*, July, 1936, p. 246.) Dr. Alleman and Dr. Drach and the others say, "The Bible contains the Word of God." The Catalog of Testimonies says in the Conclusion: "God's Word is comprised in the Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles" (*Trigl.*,

p. 1149). But there is a vast difference between the two statements, the difference between saying that parts of the Bible are not God's Word and that all of the Bible is God's Word. No, these men cannot speak Lutheran on this point. The best they can do is to say: "The Bible is the Word of God because it contains the Word of God." (J. A. W. Haas, in *What Is Lutheranism,* p. 176.) And we protest against such a statement as being an attempt to speak the language of the Confessions without uttering the full sense of the Confessions as to the full reliability of every part of Scripture. The present time demands a firm reaffirmation of the truth confessed in the Old Protestant standards, in the Episcopalian Book of Common Prayer and in the Lutheran Book of Concord, as quoted above. E.

A Voice from the Augustana Synod. — In the *Lutheran Companion* of April 28, 1938, we find an article by George Stephenson, of the Department of History, University of Minnesota, having the title "Whither Augustana?" He lists the forces that bind the synod together and enumerates them as follows: 1. the lingering and still potent spirit of nationality; 2. the point of view and influence of the older leaders in the Augustana Synod, to whom Swedish is the language of childhood; 3. vested interests — schools, hospitals, orphan homes, even the synod and conferences themselves; 4. the liturgy of the Augustana Synod, which is different from that of other Lutheran bodies; 5. the natural inertia in the great body of the synod's membership.

Next he lists forces that work for Lutheran unity. 1. The virtual cessation of immigration from Sweden. As a result the Augustana Synod has become an English Lutheran body. 2. "With the exception of a single large and powerful body there are no formidable doctrinal walls that divide the Augustana Synod from sister synods." 3. Intra- and extramural proselyting in the Lutheran Church has almost entirely disappeared. 4. Controversies that formerly raged over certain questions — secret societies, amusements, the puritanical Sabbath, and the like — have largely vanished. 5. "Institutionalism is in the ascendency in American Lutheranism, and in the Augustana Synod High Church tendencies are unmistakable. Vestments, gowns, and choir robes are among the adiaphora." 6. "The activity and influence of laymen in the Augustana Synod is a twentieth-century phenomenon, and it will increase. Many surprises would be in store for pastors in the Augustana Synod if they made a systematic effort to plumb the doctrinal depth of their parishioners. 7. There is not much interest among pastors and laymen in the history of the Augustana Synod. 8. Through the depression and the resulting financial difficulties of the synod and its conferences the desire has been strengthened to avoid duplication in education, in Home and Foreign Missions, etc. 9. "Events at home and abroad are moving with cataclysmic swiftness; the spirit of change is in the air. A feeling of instability permeates every branch of human activity. Can the Augustana Synod by erecting and maintaining walls shut out this nation-wide spirit?"

The last paragraph is arresting: "The Church needs Conservatives as well as Liberals. It is in even greater need of animated Conservatives and Liberals who have the courage and the intelligence to differ

from their fathers as well as to withstand what may appear to be an overwhelming majority of their contemporaries. Of such persons it may be said that they are the salt of the earth." The author should have pointed out that in matters of doctrine we have to insist on loyalty to the truth. In adiaphora it is well enough to have Conservatives and Liberals. A.

Dr. Leander Keyser's Defense of Biblical Inspiration. — In 1935 the late Dr. Leander Keyser of the Hamma Divinity School (U. L. C.) published in *Christian Faith and Life* a sharp criticism of the Presbyterian Auburn Affirmation, under the title "That Famous Auburn Affirmation." The article is now being spread in pamphlet form by Fundamentalistic Presbyterians, since it briefly but strikingly proves the Unitarian character of the Auburn Affirmation. Among other things Dr. Keyser takes issue with the modernistic authors and signers of the Auburn Affirmation on account of their repudiation of Biblical inspiration. Dr. Keyser writes: "Let us note what they say on the question of the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church made this clear pronouncement in 1923: 'It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.' Against this statement the Affirmationists protest. They do *not believe in an inerrant Bible.* Note what they say: 'There is no assertion in the Scriptures that their writers were kept from error. The Confession of Faith does not make this assertion, and it is significant that this assertion is not found in the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed or in any of the great Reformation Confessions. The doctrine of inerrancy, intended to enhance the authority of the Scriptures, in fact impairs their supreme authority for faith and life and weakens the testimony of the Church to the power of God unto salvation through Jesus Christ. We hold that the General Assembly of 1923, in asserting that "the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error," spoke without warrant of the Scriptures, or of the Confession of Faith. We hold rather to the words of the Confession of Faith that the Scriptures "are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life" (Conf. I: 2). Let us analyze this manifesto to see whether it rings true. They declare that the Scriptures make no claim that their writers were kept from error. Well, Paul's First Epistle to Timothy is a part of the Holy Scriptures, is it not? Paul, in speaking of the Old Testament, said: 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' 2 Tim. 3:16. That is, it is God-breathed. Would God inspire men to write error? What kind of divine inspiration would that be? And remember Paul said: *'all* Scripture.' Peter's Second Epistle is also a part of Holy Scripture. Let us quote him again: 'For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' 2 Pet. 1:21. If the Holy Spirit moved those prophets, is it not clearly understood that He would have kept them from error? Why would their utterances be attributed to the Holy Spirit if they contained human errors? But the Auburn Affirmers contradict themselves in the paragraph quoted above. They hold that the General Assembly

was wrong in saying that the Biblical writers were so inspired as to be kept from error; yet, in concluding their paragraph, they hold that the Scriptures are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life. What kind of logic and theology is that? If Holy Scripture is given by inspiration of God, must it not be inerrant? Would God inspire men to write error? And here is a most serious consideration. If the Bible contains both error and truth, who is so wise as to tell us what is true and what is not true? In that case we would have to fall back on fallible human reason, and that would be the old rationalism of fifty to a hundred years ago, which has proved itself to be such a dismal failure. Moreover, this view is Modernism out and out. It is not evangelical and historical Christianity. An errant Bible leaves the human family in the mists of uncertainty. If the Bible is to be the rule of faith and life, it must speak in no precarious tones."

What Dr. Keyser argues so convincingly in this article is certainly correct. It is a strange thing, however, that, were Dr. Keyser alive today, he would have to argue this truth not merely against the Auburn Affirmationists in the modernistic Presbyterian Church, but also against prominent theologians in the United Lutheran Church, of which he himself was a member. As has been shown in these columns repeatedly, these liberal Lutheran theologians have adopted the modernistic views of the Presbyterian Affirmationists, denying the inerrancy of Holy Scripture. For this reason also what they teach on this point is not evangelical and historic Christianity but "Modernism out and out." J. T. M.

Lutheranism or Revivalism? — From an article by Pastor John Milton which appeared under this heading in the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod) of April 21, we quote the following: "Recently the following question was received by the Question Box department: 'Is not revivalism beginning more and more to be looked upon as a means of grace in our Synod? Or how do you explain the fact that Holy Baptism is so seldom referred to?' Answer: 'From the viewpoint of a sound Scriptural exegesis I do not see how Baptism as a means of regeneration can be set aside without doing violence to the whole plan and purpose of God with regard to the making of disciples. The choice of language in Matt. 28:19, 20 is decisive. It is one command with two parts to it: to make disciples by baptizing and by teaching to observe the commandments of Christ. . . . There has been a tendency, and we see it still, to consider a man a Christian just because he has been baptized, regardless of whether he today with his lips and life confesses Christ as his Savior. It almost seems that some Lutherans hold to the slogan that 'once saved, always saved,' if applied to the experience in baptism. . . . It is inevitable that such an extreme should invite a swing to the other extreme, to an emphasis on present life and experience which comes dangerously close to denying all spiritual experience to baptism. There is such a tendency today within Lutheran circles. To a very considerable extent it clothes itself in the forms and methods of Reformed revivalism. It so quickly assumes that a man is not a Christian unless he can point to some definite moment of 'conversion.' At the very least, it assumes that a baptized person is more likely to have fallen from the baptismal covenant than not. . . . Worst of all, in my judgment, is the amazing

self-confidence with which some within this group presume to tell at a glance whether a man is saved or unsaved. . . . Let us remember that final judgment as to any man's relationship to Christ belongs to Christ alone. He is the Judge, not we. Some glib lip confessions of Christ may mean less than those which are more hesitant, just because they are more sincere. I confess that I don't care much for that brand of piety which can pray and testify of a definite conversion but which cannot forgive a sin or show ordinary charity or courtesy towards those who have come to a conscious faith in Christ by a quieter process than that of the sudden or violent conversion. . . . Christians need to be quickened and awakened; yes, they need even to be converted in the sense of the daily conversion, which consists in a daily renewed penitence and faith. Let us learn not to speak as if all men must pass through a violent spiritual crisis before they can be called Christian. . . . We need to be revived, all of us, continually, some more, some less; but may God help us to see the difference between such a 'reviving' and the artificial technique of a 'revivalism' which counts souls as if they were passing through a human turnstile into the kingdom of God.' "

In the May issue of the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference* Dr. K. Ermisch states: "It seems to me that the great issue in our American Lutheran Conference is just the question of piety vs. pietism." (P. 22.) In the article "Additional Thoughts on Piety and Pietism" (p. 24 ff.) Editor Dell discusses revivalism, the editor of the *Lutheran Messenger,* of the Augsburg Seminary faculty, having found fault with his views on revivalism. We quote a few paragraphs. "I want you all to know exactly why I am not keen on revivalism in the Lutheran Church, and I want you all to believe that I am nevertheless a Christian. Note that it is revivalism I oppose and not revival. Revival is 'bringing back to life,' and it is the work of the Holy Spirit. Revivalism is a human technique, a system of methods by which men think to make the success of the Holy Spirit more probable. That original editorial of mine said: 'Any *revivalistic* (not revival) tendency in the Lutheran Church gets short shrift from me.' . . . There are other things I dislike even more [than "the revival type of hymn"]. For example, its unrestrained emotionalism. Please do not think of me now as a 'stolid German' who is incapable of emotion. And do not conclude that I am a cold intellectual who thinks of religion only as a set of propositions to be intellectually apprehended. I teach my classes in religious education that intellect, emotion, and will are inseparable in the soul. . . . What is it, then, that is objectionable in the use of the emotional technique in the Bible camps? For one thing, it takes no account of the fact that these are *young* people we are dealing with. And young people, though they feel deeply, do not wish to make public display of their feelings. It is unnatural for them to do so, and to force them to do it against their will only awakens resentment in them. The very ones whom religion has touched deeply are the ones who will not bring out those deep inner responses of their souls for you to finger and handle in public. Those feelings are too sacred, and the souls are too shy. . . . For another thing, this emotional technique at the Bible camps takes no account of the fact that these are fine *Lutheran* young people we are

dealing with. One of the questions asked me above was: 'Do you not believe it possible for a person baptized as an infant to fall away from Christ and become as a lost sheep which must be brought back?' I answered, Yes. But the point is that sometimes it seems to be taken for granted that *all* of our Lutheran young people who were baptized as infants have fallen away from Christ and need to be converted. . . . The normal Lutheran way for baptized children to develop into Christian maturity is for them to *grow up* in the Christian life as uneventfully as a bud expanding into a flower. Testimony is not wanting that this is a better way than the way of storm and stress. . . . These four non-Lutherans describe the normal experience of a Lutheran child baptized in infancy. Ours has been the technique of religious education, not that of revivalism. Now, when non-Lutherans are recognizing the superiority of our methods, should we Lutherans abandon our methods and reach out after those which they are discarding? In our view those children have been God's children since God received them in Holy Baptism in infancy. We believe in baptismal regeneration; sects that developed the revivalistic technique did not. Here is a difference that runs clear down to basic doctrines. . . . Again I ask, How shall we attain the desired end of more sanctification of life? By demanding of our young people that they testify? By working on their emotions with revival hymns? By calling on them for public prayer? That would be demanding the harvest before having sown the seed, would it not? That is not a way of bringing people into contact with the grace of the Spirit; that is a *fruit* of the Spirit. The *means* by which the Spirit works is the Word. Neglect of the means of grace is bound to result in a lessening of the influence of the Spirit in our lives. A part of Jesus' prayer for His Church is: 'Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth.'"

E.

The Wesley Bicentennial. — On May 24 two hundred years had elapsed since Wesley had his remarkable experience in a meeting in Aldersgate Street, London. It is proper that we should record here how he himself in his *Journal* wrote about this experience.

"I think it was about five this morning that I opened my Testament on those words: 'There are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, even that ye shall be partakers of the divine nature.' Just as I went out, I opened it again on those words: 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.'

"In the afternoon I was asked to go to St. Paul's. The anthem was: 'Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord; Lord, hear my voice. O let Thine ears consider well the voice of my complaint. If Thou, Lord, wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who may abide it? But there is mercy with Thee; therefore Thou shalt be feared. O Israel, trust in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is plenteous redemption. And He shall redeem Israel from all his sins.'

"In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my

heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."

Strange to say, a little more than half a year later (January 4) Wesley made this entry in his *Journal:* "Though I have given, and do give, all my goods to feed the poor, I am not a Christian. Though I have endured hardship, though I have in all things denied myself and taken up my cross, I am not a Christian. My works are nothing; my sufferings are nothing; I have not the fruits of the Spirit of Christ. Though I have constantly used all the means of grace for twenty years, I am not a Christian." An editorial in the *Christian Century* points out that after this lamentation, written in January, 1739, the *Journal* of Wesley contains no similar note any more. In answering the question, how it happened that Wesley now ceased that morbid self-examination to which he had been given, the editorial replies: "The answer seems to be simply that Wesley suddenly lost himself in service for others, in his mission, and he never had time to fall back into his former introversion. For in that early spring of 1739 George Whitefield, having raised congregations of thousands of brutalized miners on the hillsides near Bristol, sent for Wesley to come down from London to help him. Leaving London took John Wesley out of the hothouse atmosphere of the Fetter Lane society into the open air. It proved the beginning of the marvelous ministry which was to carry him more than two hundred and fifty thousand miles over the roads — or what then passed for roads — of England, preaching on the average three times a day and bearing administrative burdens beyond reckoning. No wonder that William T. Stead wrote of this once tubercular little man as one who gave the impression of having a 'marvelous body, with muscles of whipcord and bones of steel, with lungs of leather and the heart of a lion.'"

A few more of the points which the editorial raises must be mentioned. We are told that for a number of years Wesley and his brother Charles, "remembering their own experience and seeing the evidences of sudden conversion among the sodden or brutalized masses to whom they were preaching, insisted that all their converts could enter the Methodist ranks only after passing through the same sort of sudden, dramatic crisis. In the case of many of the desperate men ond women with whom the Wesleys had to deal, there was sound psychological reason to expect an experience of that cataclysmic nature. But as he grew older, Wesley's appreciation of the varieties of religious experience grew broader; he confided to one of his ministers his wonder that he and his brother had not been stoned for their stiff insistence on one mode of conversion in their younger days."

The editorial further remarks: "As Wesley's sympathies for other varieties of religious experience broadened, his reticence toward his own deepened. In later life he could rarely be induced to say anything about it. While his Methodists were not slow to claim all manner of spiritual achievements, ranging up to 'entire sanctification,' Wesley never made any such claims for himself. Once, when his intimate, Samuel Bradburn, pressed him for a testimony as to his spiritual experience, Wesley shyly answered that it was most nearly suggested by the lines

of one of his brother's hymns: 'O Thou, who camest from above.' Beyond that, he would not commit himself. Many entries in his *Journal*, together with the minutes of his conferences, show with what reserve — and indeed skepticism — he regarded the extravagant spiritual claims of many of his followers."

In thinking of Wesley's work, facts such as those mentioned above should not be overlooked, in order that our judgment of his activities do not become one-sided. A.

The Meeting at Utrecht. — From May 9 to 13 the eyes of the religious world were focused on Utrecht, where eighty men representing a large number of denominations were gathered "to confer upon a plan for a world council, to be submitted to the churches, and to determine upon an interim organization wherewith to carry on the work of the Commission on Faith and Order and that of the Commission on Life and Work." As these words indicate, the meeting was intended to continue the work of the two large interdenominational conferences held last summer, the one at Oxford, the other at Edinburgh. Besides Protestant bodies the Old Catholics and the Greek Orthodox churches were represented. From the United States there had come a delegation representing Episcopalians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Friends (Quakers), the Polish National Catholics, and Negro churches. The large "alliances" had sent delegates — the Baptist World Alliance, the Lutheran World Convention, the Protestant World Alliance, the World Student Christian Federation, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the World Sunday-school Association, the Ecumenical Youth Commission, and the European Central Bureau for Church Aid. What an imposing list of organizations! It seems that three languages were used, English, German, and French. Speeches, after a subject had been introduced, were limited to five minutes. The Archbishop of York, Dr. Temple, presided. "There was by resolution no balloting, no counting of support and opposition, no lobbying, no attempt to coerce or control — only free discussion, which led finally to practical unanimity." The request of Unitarians and of the World Alliance that the meeting should not declare belief in "our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior" was rejected, we are glad to say. This statement points to what is called "the one great and primary and central and most significant decision" inasmuch as it represents the adoption of a doctrinal base for the plan for a world council to be submitted to the churches. This doctrinal base is included in the brief statement that what is contemplated is "a fellowship of churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior." The writer whom we are quoting, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Chicago, Dr. Stewart, says: "We know that only upon a solid foundation of a common faith can we realize unity. There is not a Church on the continent that is one bit interested in a federation of churches for social service. They all agree that such a plan is superficial. There must be rooted faith in God Incarnate." One wonders whether the bishop's favorable judgment on the attitude of the Continental churches is not an exaggeration.

The planned world assembly is not to have any authority over the various constituent churches. Besides, provision has been made for

letting at least one fourth of the assembly members be laymen (or lay women). The work of the World Conference on Life and Work and of that on Faith and Order is to be continued. A fairly large committee will be established for this purpose. We are told that the question of intercommunion was not discussed. However, joint services were held, in which the spokesmen were taken from the various denominations. It is clear that we are here dealing with a grossly unionistic venture. How the American Lutherans that participated can continue being connected with it, unless they have protested and continue to protest against the many features of doctrinal indifference which characterize it, we simply cannot understand. A.

Union of Methodists Assured. — When the Southern Methodists in May met in Birmingham, Ala., the decisive vote on the union of the three Methodist bodies that have been negotiating with each other to amalgamate was taken. It was overwhelmingly in favor of the plan of union, 434 of the delegates voting affirmatively and only 26 negatively. The three bodies in question are the Methodist Episcopal Church (Northern Methodists), the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The first two of these bodies had previously voted in favor of the plan of union. Among the arguments that were offered against union the race question was given a prominent place. One is surprised to see that in the reports on the debate, which lasted a whole day, the ultramodernistic character of much of the teaching in vogue among Northern Methodists was not stressed. The South is known to be conservative, and we suppose that Southern Methodists share in this conservatism; but if they used this laudable tendency to remain true to the old message as a weapon against the advocacy of union with Northern Methodists, the reports we have seen fail to make mention of it. The new church-body formed by this merger will number almost eight million members living here in America. If size is to be aimed at in church-work, then we are here viewing a commendable achievement. But we may well say that just as little as the kingdom of God is meat and drink, Rom. 14:17, so little is it dependent on the outward size of church-bodies and their secular wealth and influence. A.

What is Meant by "the Son of God"? — The *Sunday-school Times* (March 26, 1938) under this heading quotes for the orthodox interpretation of this expression against that of Unitarian Liberalism, the unbiased testimony of the late Don Marquis. In introducing this clever and often profound writer, it declares: "Toward the end of December [1937], three days before the new year began, a brilliant journalist, poet, and playwright, Don Marquis, died. Though not apparently a professing Christian, he published a statement some years ago that is a remarkably significant answer to the question that heads this editorial. It is the answer of an open-minded literary man of the world. It was part of an author's note at the end of a play Don Marquis had written, *The Dark Hours*, which is a dramatic setting forth of the last twenty-four hours in the earthly life of Christ, culminating in His death on the cross. The extended newspaper accounts of the death of Don Marquis mention his famous newspaper columns in the *New York Sun*

and the *New York Herald Tribune,* his poems and another book, but made no mention of the *The Dark Hours,* which a literary critic has called 'one of the few great dramas ever written in the United States.' Another critic said: 'He has published a drama of poignant beauty and memorable reality on the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus. Whether any other poet in America could have approached his achievement on this theme I do not know. No one has.'"

What Don Marquis discovered when he read through the four gospels, and this contrary to his expectations (as he expressly tells us), he strikingly summed up in the following antimodernistic witness concerning the "Son of God" of the four gospels: "I believe there is a contemporary school of thought which holds that, when Jesus spoke of His Father, He meant that God is the Father of all of us — the Father of Jesus and of you and of me and of everybody else in much the same way. And I rather inclined myself to the opinion that such was the meaning of Jesus. But the careful and repeated examination of the Bible necessary for this play has convinced me that it was not His meaning. I cannot escape the conviction that He intended to convey that He was the Son of God in a sense special and unique, that He differed from other men who might call God their Father not merely in the degree of His spirituality but also in the character of His relationship to His Father. You may or may not believe this; I may or may not believe it — but I cannot evade the belief that Jesus Himself believed it. He seems to me to have been as explicit as possible in this claim. Either the four gospels have not reported Him correctly, or He meant just that. At least I can make nothing else out of it, and I began an examination of the Bible with a contrary view. It was for this assertion, that He was the Son of God, that the Sanhedrin condemned Him, for the Sanhedrin considered it blasphemy. If He had meant anything else or anything less, He would have answered otherwise when the question was discharged at Him pointblank by Caiaphas and His life or death hung upon the answer. He died for that belief because it *was* His belief. To think of Him as dying for some belief that He did not really hold, seems to me to be merely idiocy. You or I may hold what opinion we will, but I do not see how, if we accept His reported utterances as evidence, we can have any doubt as to the opinion of Jesus Himself. My intention is nothing exegetical, but only to present my view. And I make this note merely because I think His claim to be the Son of God in a special sense is the central knot of the drama of His closing hours on earth. When Caiaphas, the high priest, heard this claim from Jesus' own lips, he rose and rent his garments, crying, 'Blasphemy!' and the Sanhedrin condemned Jesus to death."

This certainly is a most weighty witness to the fact that the Christ of the Bible is the divine Christ, God's Son in a unique sense, as the Christian Church has ever confessed Him. J. T. M.

Conditions at American Theological Seminaries. — The following letter appearing in the *Presbyterian* of April 14 should be pondered:

"In your issue of February 14 I was interested in the article 'Do We Need Trained Ministers?' by the Rev. Dr. H. S. Brown of Princeton. In this article he calls attention to the falling off in recent years in gifts

to our theological seminaries. These gifts being so small in comparison with those to other educational enterprises, the question naturally arises, What are the reasons? Why are the givers in our churches so reluctant to support so worthy a cause? It is an open secret that many who would be disposed to remember these schools of the prophets are held back in doing so because of the perversion of trust funds committed to their keeping by our fathers in years of the past. I do not have in mind any of the seminaries mentioned by Dr. Brown in his article but many such schools in our and other denominations. I have just read again the chapter on the 'Looting of Andover,' by Ernest Gordon in his *Leaven of the Sadducees.* That once great citadel of orthodoxy, founded and endowed at a great sacrifice to offset Unitarianism and Universalism and to promote evangelical Christianity and which safeguarded its creed by every possible device to hold its teachers to their covenant vows, — nevertheless we find its directors, who were the custodians of her trust funds as also the guardian of the doctrines taught by her professors, shamefully violating their solemn oaths and handing over her endowments and property to the keeping care of Unitarian Harvard. Read also the chapter in this book of Gordon's on 'The Apostate Seminaries.' What a blight it reveals on American Christianity! Professors holding down chairs endowed at a great sacrifice by godly people in past years to teach evangelical doctrines, but teaching that which would be acceptable in any Unitarian school in the land. These revelations are certainly an eye-opener. Look at Union Theological Seminary, once so famous in the days of Shedd, Schaff, Robinson, Smith, and Adams but now sending forth young men who are acceptable in any heterodox church in the land.

"The writer is a graduate of what was once one of the soundest Calvinistic seminaries of the Congregational body — a school as true to evangelical doctrine as Princeton ever was, a school founded and endowed to teach the tenets of the Christian faith; but if it keeps on degenerating in the next ten years as it has in the past twenty-five, an agnostic wanting a position on its faculty to teach agnosticism could have it. These remarks are not aimed at the seminaries listed by Dr. Brown, for, as far as I know, they are teaching what our General Assembly would have them teach and, so far as I know, are worthy of the confidence and support of our churches. Yet, nevertheless, the great body of intelligent givers are well aware of the unsavory history of the dishonest use of funds entrusted to the care of those who have the management of the funds given to perpetuate the faith of the Church. Such a history is unfortunate for the seminaries that are worthy of support; nevertheless givers are slow to open their pocketbooks because of the suspicion that history may repeat itself. I put this forth as one of the reasons. My years in the ministry in dealing with people confirm it." A.

The Same Old Intolerance. — According to the *Christian Century* Cardinal Villeneuve of Montreal delivered a speech in which he laid down the following points:

1. The granting of freedom to various religions and even to areligious

sects is perverse Liberalism, the effort of eighteenth-century rationalism. States should not be neutral in regard to God.

2. True freedom is freedom to believe and practise the truth. The Roman Catholic Church has the truth.

3. All other churches are false and their teachings are false, except in so far as they coincide with Roman Catholic teaching. They are to be tolerated only in so far as they are willing to cooperate for the common good in conformity with natural morality and Christian revelation.

4. It is a false conception of liberty and of the role of the State to put the divine Law and the authority of the Church on a common footing with all other systems of doctrine and all other religious denominations. "As if society could in principle and of deliberate purpose consent to allow some to serve the Lord and others to deny Him their service, or at least to serve Him badly."

5. Human rights are not absolute. "It is never permitted to argue, to defend, to grant, freedom of thought, writing, or teaching and the indifferentiated freedom of religions as so many rights which nature has given to man." These liberties may be tolerated only if "a chaste temperament prevents them from degenerating into license and disorder."

6. Democracy, considered as the rule of the majority in a State, is necessarily rejected in favor of rule by those who have "the truth." "I do not want any kind of democracy; I want an aristocratic democracy." "The most libertarian democracies, arrived more or less at the term of their dissolution, can be saved only if the most penetrating authority . . . recovers possession of them and preserves them. It is thus they have risen in Italy and elsewhere."

Rome cannot see that opposition to error must not include an attempt to employ the powers of the government in such opposition. Its conception is that the kingdom of Christ is of this world. The above summary shows that Cardinal Villeneuve stands on the platform of Pius IX and Leo XIII. A.

The Confession of a Higher Critic. — Dr. H. L. Willett (professor emeritus, University of Chicago) is a thoroughgoing higher critic. He is recognized as a leader in the realm of higher criticism. The *Christian Century*, Jan. 26, 1938, states that "Lyman Abbott once declared that no man in America has done so much as Professor Willett to open the new Bible of the historical criticism to the popular understanding." Well, the Question Box of the *Christian Century* of March 2, 1938, contained this question: "What is the 'Q' or Matthean 'Q' on which the gospels are said to be founded?" and this answer by Dr. Willett: "In the textual criticism of the gospels one of the documents which scholars have assumed as a source used by the first and the third gospel along with the gospel of Mark was a writing, perhaps in Aramaic, dealing with the teaching of Jesus, and possibly from the hand of Matthew himself. It has been given various names by different authorities, such as the 'Logia' or 'sayings,' or the 'Quelle,' or 'source,' often referred to as 'Q.'" Please underscore the words "have assumed," "perhaps," and "possibly" and read Professor Willett's statement once more. Question: Did Matthew

write "Q"? Answer by the higher critic: We do not know. Question: Did he write it in Aramaic? Answer: We do not know. Question: Was this "Q" one of the sources of the first and third gospels? Answer: We do not know. Question: Did this mythical writing affect the writings of the evangelists? Answer: It certainly did; that is one of the assured results of higher criticism.

The higher critics certainly know on what flimsy foundations their theories rest. If they do not know it, their leader is here telling them. And still they keep on declaiming on the "established results of higher criticism" and protesting that they cannot conscientiously accept the doctrine of verbal inspiration. The *Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine* (Church of England) asks us to accept the findings of higher criticism with a firm faith, and on the basis of this *Report* a writer in the *Living Church* proclaims that the days "when higher criticism was undreamed of" are happily past and "scholars engaged in scientific Bible research read in its [the *Report's*] recognition of the legitimacy of their work and its insistence that the freedom for carrying out their work be not denied to them the Magna Carta of their liberties" (see CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., May, 1938, p. 384). Dr. E. H. Delk, a leader of the liberal wing of the U. L. C., tells us that he can no longer believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible because of the assured results of higher criticism and is glad that "higher criticism has set theology free from that tyrannous literalism and false idea of inspiration which," etc. (*Lutheran Quarterly*, Oct., 1912, p. 568. *Lehre u. Wehre*, 1913, p. 154.) Dr. Willett himself states: "If it has been proved in the process of critical inquiry that . . . Moses is only a common denominator for the legislation of Israel rather than the lawgiver which later Hebrew tradition made him to be . . .; that the four gospels are anonymous . . .; that the relation of the Apostle Paul to the Pastoral Epistles is improbable . . .; if, let it be repeated, it has become evident that these are among the conclusions to which painstaking and accurate scholarship has been led, the result is not the discrediting of these portions of the Bible but rather a closer approach to their true origin and purpose." (*The Bible through the Centuries*, p. 260 f.) — The *New Testament Commentary*, Alleman, uses similar language.

We are wondering how much of this "accurate" scholarship is made up of *assumeds* and *perhapses* and *possiblys*. As for us, we are not going to exchange our verbally inspired Bible for the "new Bible" advertised by Willett and Delk and Alleman and the *Report of the Doctrinal Commission*. We do not want a Bible built upon *assumed* and *perhaps* and *possibly*. E.

Modernism with a Vengeance. — Speaking of church services during Holy Week, the London correspondent of the *Living Church*, after describing some of the services using the old liturgy, says: "Contrasted with these ancient and beautiful rites is the conduct of services in the Birmingham parish of Harborne, in which the Modernist Bishop Barnes resides. The modernist vicar Canon Richardson has rewritten the Gloria, has invented two creeds more to his satisfaction than the Nicene and the Apostles', and has made a variety of interpolations in, and abstractions from, the Communion service. His Communion service was cele-

brated in his church on Maundy Thursday evening, the chalice being administered by a Methodist minister and the sermon preached by a Salvation Army lass — a member of a body which condemns Holy Communion and all other sacraments. The *Church Times* insists that this is a flagrant act of fantastic lawlessness, which calls for interference on the part of the archbishop of the province." Yes, indeed. The bishop of the province, Dr. Barnes, will, of course, not interfere, because he is an arch-Modernist himself. A.

A Beautiful Tribute to Missionaries in China. — George E. Sokolsky, the celebrated author and newspaper man, in an article published recently in the *New York Herald Tribune,* paid splendid tribute to the missionaries in China who are continuing sturdily to do their work in spite of all difficulties and danger. He writes:

"The most significant job done by Americans in China is neither the buying nor the selling of goods. It is so great a work that it is altogether misunderstood by small minds and even smaller hearts. That is the tremendously important and valuable services of the American missionary.

"These men and women have gone to town and village, bringing with them not only the many varieties of Christianity but a new cultural pattern — in my opinion, a nobler cultural pattern than the Chinese retained amid the disintegration of China's indigenous social and intellectual establishments during the last century. . . .

"These missionaries brought medicine and hospital and nursing and child welfare to China. They brought a new conception of social relationships, — not man for his family but man for society, — a broadening of viewpoint.

"They planted the seeds of a social revolution which, if it did not quickly make China strong, at any rate produced in China a forward-looking, progressive, non-opium-smoking, monogamous leadership. . . .

"It is impossible to overemphasize the great value to China of the American missionary, of the American school and hospital situated in that country. And it is something to note in these days of collectivist materialism that there has been no return to the United States for this service. It has cost us more, over a century, than we ever earned out of our trade with China. It was the contribution of a well-off people to those who needed our help and assistance.

"And it is to be noted here that in a measure we did as well by Japan. It is true that the Japanese, sooner than the Chinese, were ready to take over many schools and hospitals which American good will had established in their country. But for years our missionaries labored there as in China — not forcing anything down unwilling throats but offering help and service to those who were willing and eager to receive.

"I have known the American missionary in China well. He has been my friend. I have lived at his house. He has dined at my table. I know of no human beings who are more self-sacrificing, more loyal to the people among whom they live, more generous, and less materially rewarded for an arduous life than most American missionaries. No matter what happens to China, most of them will remain at their posts, valiantly laboring for the simple people who love them." — *N. L. C. Bulletin*

A Surprise. — We have all become accustomed to seeing Modernists endeavoring to bury all polemics in the work of the Church and urging that there should be no more doctrinal controversies. Imagine, then, the surprise we experienced when a recent article of the *Christian Century*, written by its editor, Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, in New York, not only bore the caption "The Return of Controversy" but stated very definitely that doctrinal controversy is unavoidable. He says there are three strong convictions which are held widely by the leaders of the Church: that Christianity is true; "that its responsibility for civilization is more clear and vastly greater than the churches ever before realized"; and that "the inherent nature of the Church as the body of Christ, together with the faithful exercise of its function in the world, requires that its sectarian divisions give place to a new organic expression of the Christian community in which the spiritual treasures and powers of each part shall become the treasure and powers of the whole body." Explaining his position, Dr. Morrison continues: "It is because these three affirmative convictions are taking form in the mind of the Church that the old-fashioned subjects of Christian controversy are coming to life again. These subjects constitute the obstacles which must be removed if these convictions are to be translated into action and living organization. Questions of Baptism, the Eucharist, ordination of ministers, liturgy, polity, as well as questions of creed, these are all bound to emerge when the churches begin to talk to one another in terms of their common faith. Such subjects are the *given* elements of the problem of a united Christianity. One may take a top-lofty attitude toward them. One may be highly impatient with any discussion of them — but they are there! They cannot be solved by ignoring them."

That certainly is refreshing. We do not agree with Dr. Morrison when he, continuing, says that these matters are not of vital importance and that, if the Church were united, it would be unjustified to start divisions on account of a difference of opinion on the points enumerated. But one must give him credit for recognizing that the widely advocated policy of forgetting the doctrinal differences now dividing the churches will not solve the difficulties Christianity is facing. It is true that Dr. Morrison insists controversy must take on a different character from that which it had years ago. We quote: "The old controversies differed from the new in that they proceeded from a fundamentally different motive. All our old-fashioned controversies over polity, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, ordination, and doctrine were motivated by the need of providing an apologetic for the existence of this denomination or that. This is the case no longer. No one cares now about the apologetic which any denomination can give for its separate existence. Its Christian right to a separate sectarian existence is under challenge, and that not alone by its neighbors but by itself! A wholly new kind of interest in these denominational differences has emerged. We are interested in them because they stand in the way of the Church's unity and catholicity. The new controversy arises in this perspective. The aim of the old controversy was apologetic; the aim of the new is irenic. In the old controversy the right of schism was taken for granted; in the new the fact of schism is deplored in humility and penitence. The old contro-

versy was an attempt to justify differences and divisions; the new is an attempt to heal and transcend them. To this fundamental distinction between the old and the new controversy we must add another. The subjects are indeed the same, but new criteria have emerged, by which conclusions are to be judged. Our thinkers and leaders return to these old-fashioned differences emancipated from the legalism and literalism which characterized the old-time type. . . . No issue between the churches can now be settled by the quotation of a Biblical text, as our fathers used to assume. No issue will be settled by reference to an authoritarian standard, whether doctrinal or ecclesiastical," etc.

We shall not take the time to differentiate between what is true and false in this passage. It must suffice that we say that in our opinion Dr. Morrison does our ancestors a cruel wrong when he thinks that in their controversies they were actuated exclusively by the motives which he assigns to them and that they did not have the desire to bring about peace and harmony in all Christendom, and that his position as to the authority of one Bible-text certainly is not in keeping with the recognition of the Bible as our supreme authority in matters of faith and life. But we are happy to see that there is at least one Modernist who is wise enough to perceive that a united Church cannot be built on a foundation of disunited creeds. A.

Brief Items. — A writer in Vienna declares that Roman Catholicism in Austria capitulated to Hitler. Speaking about the audience which Cardinal Innitzer sought with the *Fuehrer,* he writes this striking sentence, "A cardinal had gone to Canossa." Developments will have to show to what extent this view is justified.

It seems that in Georgia a new sect calling itself the "Kingdom of Jehovah" has made its appearance. It was given publicity when in Griffin, Ga., one of its members was arrested for distributing tracts and a magazine issued by the sect. The Supreme Court of Georgia, after the Court of Appeals had upheld the Griffin authorities in their action, reversed this decision, declaring that in the interest of religious freedom the city ordinance of Griffin, Ga., which was responsible for the arrest mentioned, would have to be held invalid. One wonders whether this is the same sect as "Jehovah's Witnesses" (Russellites)?

From 1920 to 1930 120,000 suicides were reported in the United States. It has been correctly stated that here we are facing one of our country's most alarming problems. Indications are that the number of suicides from 1930—1940 will be vastly larger than that of the preceding decade.

The Episcopalians here and abroad are having their troubles, and deservedly, because the denomination does not resist the inroads of Modernism as it should. In England the so-called Catholic Advisory Council, which is backed by two thousand Anglo-Catholic ministers and fifty thousand Anglo-Catholic laymen, makes an attack on the *Statement of Doctrine,* which was issued by a special committee of the Church of England some time ago. What is criticized is the doctrinal laxity of the report of the commission. Besides, there are other things in the teaching and practise of the Church of England to which exception is taken, for instance, the communing of people who are not members of

the Church of England, the recognition of the office of the ministry in Protestant denominations other than the Episcopalian (an error on the part of the critics), the remarriage of divorced persons, the assistance given by bishops to movements for union in India and elsewhere. In our own country 1,406 clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church have signed a statement which is directed especially against the practise of letting people commune who are not members of the Protestant Episcopal Church. These people very correctly state that the tendency they criticize will not accelerate union but rather hinder it.

Recently Karl Barth visited in London. Naturally, he was asked about the situation in Germany. When the inquiry was placed before him whether the Gospel can be preached in that country without interference, he is said to have replied: "Yes, if the message consists of 'innocuous sentiments.'" He is quoted as saying that a "spiritual Gospel" is not opposed, but it must not affect the lives of people here on earth. To what extent he is reporting actual facts will have to be determined by those who have first-hand knowledge of the situation. Very alarming is a certain tendency of the German government, if he is quoted correctly and states facts. According to his view, the German Government has the intention of cutting the youth off from the Church, so that the latter will become an association of old men and old women. It will mean that the Church will be immeasurably weakened. Barth charges that men are made professors of theology who are without experience and other necessary qualifications and whose lectures as a result are poorly attended.

How conditions affecting the churches may change is illustrated by what recently happened to a Presbyterian church in Manhattan and another one in the Bronx, New York. The influx of Negroes and Puerto Ricans into their territory was so strong that they closed their establishments and their members joined white congregations in a different neighborhood. One of the two churches which are now empty may become a Negro church.

We often forget that people are influenced far more by considerations of the heart than of the head. The *Christian Advocate* (South) makes a statement which deserves being pondered. It reads: "The stately and elaborate arguments of Butler's *Analogy* made no impress on the masses. The convincing answer to unbelief and wickedness of the day was made by the revival under Wesley and Whitefield, when the lives of men and women were transformed by the Holy Spirit, when a new hope and strength came to despairing lives and blasphemers became saints and drunkards became heralds of the saving power of Christ. The Church of today cannot but meet the cynics and scoffers by the same irrefutable logic of lives transformed by the power of the Gospel, the logic of unearthly living amid the sense-bound materialism of a self-indulgent generation." While not Christian lives, but the power of the Gospel melts sinful hearts, the importance of the testimony rendered by a Christ-centered life needs continual emphasis.

About the first of the year Bishop Arthur J. Moore of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, cabled that the disaster to Chinese churches

could not be overestimated. Nevertheless, missionaries are showing magnificent faith, courage, and persistence. The *Christian Advocate* (Nashville) quotes the following from a letter written in Shanghai by Dr. J. C. Thoroughman, superintendent of the Soochow Hospital: "We on the field think there is only one course to pursue. That is, to get back and rebuild and to face the future in a spirit of Christian service that will attempt to meet the need of the people of China in this darkest hour of their modern history. We believe this will be the wish of the Church in America when it learns the full extent of the catastrophe that has overtaken us." — *The Presbyterian.*

Four synods of the U. L. C. belonging to the six U. L. C. synods in the State of Pennsylvania have made preparations to merge. They are the following: The West Pennsylvania, the Susquehanna, the East Pennsylvania, and the Allegheny synods. The name proposed is: The Central Pennsylvania Synod. Committee reports are ready which, if adopted, will bring about this union.

A minister living in Czechoslovakia states, as the *Allg. E.-L. Kz.* reports, that his congregation is woefully in need of Bibles, that in every group of ten families, on an average, merely one owns the Holy Scriptures. The reason, he says, is that many of his people have become Lutherans through conversion from Roman Catholicism; that while they were Roman Catholics, they did not own a Bible; and that now, financial difficulties being universal, there is very little money for the purchase of Bibles.

One of our exchanges reports that Dr. Purd E. Dietz of Yale University will be inaugurated as professor of pastoral theology at Eden Theological Seminary.

The editor of the *Living Church* complains: "Another church-school, St. Albans, Sycamore, Ill., has gone under. The reason is the usual one — lack of support by church people. The neglect of church-schools and colleges is one of the most amazing phenomena of the Episcopal Church." Unfortunately, Episcopalians are not the only ones that have reason to voice such a lament.

Crime among America's youth and adolescents continues to grow. While the attempts to reform the movies were not entirely in vain and standards have been raised, the radio is becoming a very serious menace. The *Lutheran Companion* writes: "In the opinion of many, the radio has taken up the business of educating children in crime where the cinema left off. Thrilling detective stories, reeking with every human instinct of cruelty and cunning, have captivated the imaginations of millions of children and hold them spell-bound from day to day. Sex problems, love triangles, domestic unfaithfulness — these and many other sordid themes are being presented to the youthful mind, and in many instances this type of program is arousing increasing interest among the children, since it appeals to their natural curiosity."

A layman in the Church of England is sensible enough to see that, before the Anglican Church endeavors to unite with the Non-conformist churches in England, it ought to achieve a higher degree of unity within its own ranks. The layman is Lord Hugh Cecil. He believes that there

is a growing sympathy and understanding between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics, that is, the Low Church party and the High Church party. As to the Broad Church party, the Modernists, he seems to think that it will be impossible to achieve an understanding with them. More power to men of this type, we say.

In France Reformed groups have united. These bodies are the Evangelical Reformed Church, numbering about 400 congregations; the Reformed Church (a liberal body), with about 160 congregations; the Free Evangelical Church, with a few more than 50 congregations; and the Methodists, with 26 churches. These four bodies now form the Protestant Church of France. Baptists and Lutherans are not included in this union.

In an article in the *Christian Century,* headed "Japan Invades China with Drugs," the writer has this disquieting paragraph: "When the new Peace Preservation Council was set up in the largest Japanese-occupied territory last August, it was announced that the Nanking Law no longer applied. The drug habit reassumed its tyranny. Antinarcotic hospital work was stopped. In the old Japanese concession is a street in which about fifty per cent. of the houses are drug joints. They are not allowed to sell to the Japanese; but foreigners and Chinese, men and women, are offered the stuff openly as they walk through the streets." In justice one ought to add the following sentences of the writer: "No trade was apparent, however, when I visited the street (February 3); the shops had been temporarily closed the previous day. It was reported that coolies employed by the Japanese were paid part of their wages in drugs; but I was not in a position to get evidence of this."

To do their work more effectively, the press committees of eighteen Catholic societies have formed "a united Catholic front in the press and magazine field." The leaders in this movement are Jesuits voicing their views in their well-known journal *America.* If this new agency should succeed in influencing, for instance, every one, or at least the great majority, of the 1,733,954 Roman Catholics who are said to live in New York City, what power it could wield and what a menace it might become to free speech in opposing all papers and journals which fearlessly criticize Roman Catholicism and its pretensions! A.

II. Ausland

"Eccentric Services in the Church of England." — Using this caption, the *Manchester Guardian* of Jan. 28, 1938, has some illuminating remarks on conditions in the Anglican Church. The writer says: "A belief that the present disorders in the Church of England were exaggerated was expressed by the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Cyril Garbett, last week, when the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury resumed discussion of the Joint Committee's Report on Relations between Church and State. He said that there were variations in the services in different parishes, but they were quite minor and there was nothing like general disorder. 'There are services which are eccentric and even fantastic in different churches,' Dr. Garbett went on. It ought to be made perfectly plain that the bishop is the authority, and the proposed declaration will, I think, make it plain that, when the bishop gives directions, he is

speaking in the name of the Church and that he has authority over additional services as well as over the liturgical services. I think the way we could strengthen order in our Church is from within. We shall not get it from legislation or coercive action in the courts.

"The Bishop of Coventry, Dr. Haigh, supporting the proposed synodical declaration, said: Any regulation designed to reduce disorder in the sphere of public worship would command very great respect from many priests who at present either believed that the Church of England had no mind in regard to the questions at issue or thought they knew much better than the Church itself.

"The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Barnes, said he did not approve of the report. 'I speak with reluctance,' he added, 'but I am weary of the endless sacramental controversies, of which the present proposals are but another stage. I am resolved to administer the law as I can see Parliament would desire it. So I have during these last years refused institution to any man who was not willing both to have no reservation and also to obey the law when I directed it. I think I can say the result is that Birmingham, which, when I went to it, was the most disorderly diocese in England bar one, is now quite orderly save for a few surviving rebels.'

"The Archbishop of Canterbury said there was now less bitterness and party spirit in the Church of England than he had ever known. The time had come when, in the interests of rightful worship, the Prayer-book should be restored to its central position in the Church and any alterations which might be permitted should be made by the authority and command of the conscience of the Church. It was impossible to say that it should be left to Parliament to order proper public worship in the Church. Further discussion of the report and an amendment by the Bishop of Norwich were adjourned until the next meeting of Convocation."

That the institution of the episcopacy is not a panacea for all the ills which afflict the Church is quite evident from this report. A.

Die Weltkirchen auf dem Weg nach Rom. Äußerst wichtig ist, was P. O. Gerß in seinem Gemeindeblatt „Nur selig!" in bezug auf die letzte Weltkirchenkonferenz in Oxford schreibt: „Der Erzbischof von Canterbury von der englischen Kirche hat sein Bedauern ausgesprochen, daß der römische Papst an der Weltkirchenkonferenz in Oxford nicht teilgenommen hat. Zugleich hat er aber mit Befriedigung hervorgehoben, daß römisch-katholische Theologen zu den wichtigsten Mitarbeitern an den Arbeiten und Beschlüssen der Weltkirchenkonferenz gehört haben und daß die ‚wundervollen' Enzykliken (Kundgebungen) der Päpste Leos XIII. und Pius' XI. für die auf der Konferenz in Oxford gefaßten Beschlüsse über die Lehre vom staatlichen und sozialen Leben sehr wertvoll gewesen sind. Dann schreibt das Blatt des römischen Papstes, der *Osservatore Romano* in Rom, daß die katholische Kirche nicht bloß Mitarbeiterin an den Kundgebungen und Beschlüssen der Oxforder Konferenz gewesen ist, sondern ihr eigentlicher Urheber [?]. Und diese von römischem Geist durchtränkten Beschlüsse von Oxford werden nun den Christen in Deutschland dargeboten als große und herrliche Kundgebungen der allgemeinen ‚ökumenischen' Kirche Christi, die angeblich der Welt das Heil bringen soll. Das Blatt des Papstes sagt ganz mit Recht: Die evan-

gelischen Weltkirchen, die sich beim Papst ihre Weisheit borgen müssen, sollten doch lieber gleich römisch-katholisch werden und sich offen dazu bekennen. Übrigens haben von den ca. 25,000 Geistlichen der evangelischen Kirche, die in Oxford die unbestrittene Führung hatte, in den letzten acht Jahren ganze 1,016 die Lehrbeschlüsse des maßgebenden römischen Bekenntnisses, des Tridentinums (in dem die Lehre Luthers bekanntlich nicht bloß verworfen, sondern sogar verflucht wird), unterschrieben und sich verpflichtet, ihre Gemeinden in diesem römisch-katholischen Geist zu erziehen. Und ca. 2,000 andere Geistliche der englischen Kirche stimmen innerlich damit überein und beten regelmäßig mit ihren Gemeinden für die Vereinigung mit dem römischen Papsttum. (Dies ist eine Feststellung von Walter Adams in einem Antrag auf der englischen Kirchenversammlung vom 7. Februar 1938.) Mit dieser englischen Kirche aber ist die ganze Bekennende Kirche in Deutschland, von den ‚Lutherischen' um Prof. Sasse und Bischof Mahrarens an, über die Brüderräte bis zu den ausgesprochen Liberalen aufs engste verbunden und will durchaus mit ihr kirchlich verbunden bleiben! So werden die Christen in Deutschland durch dies Kirchenwesen der Bekennenden Kirche allmählich auch für den römischen Papst erzogen, ohne daß sie es merken. So wird aber auch Luther und sein Werk in Deutschland durch die Bekennende Kirche verleugnet und zunichte gemacht."

Es ist nötig, daß diese Schwäche der Bekennenden Kirche aufgedeckt wird, besonders hierzulande, wo man im allgemeinen die Bekennende Kirche zu günstig einschätzt. Solange sich die „Bekenner" innerhalb der Volkskirche Deutschlands befinden und sich von dem Staat besolden lassen müssen, bleibt ihr Bekenntnis immer schwach. So sehr es einen wundernehmen mag, daß der Papst in der Oxforder Kirchenkonferenz mitgewirkt, ja den Ton angegeben hat (?), so dürfen wir doch nicht vergessen, daß mit dem gänzlichen Unglauben der letzten Zeit (Luk. 18, 8) sich auch das Antichristentum, wie es im Papsttum vertreten ist, befestigen wird, so daß der Endechrist erst dem wiederkehrenden göttlichen Richter unterliegen wird, 2 Thess. 2, 8. Damit wollen wir durchaus nicht sagen, daß wir die Bekenntnisaussprachen solcher Männer wie Sasse nicht recht einschätzten. Sie sind in der Tat wertvoll und werden Frucht schaffen. Aber weit mehr würden sie fruchten, wenn hinter dem Wortbekenntnis auch das Tatbekenntnis des Kirchenaustritts stände. Unsere lutherische Kirche muß wieder kräftig daran erinnert werden, was die Apologie einbleut: „Wiewohl nun der Antichrist mit seinem falschen Gottesdienst zum Teil bleiben wird, bis daß Christus, der HErr, öffentlich kommen und richten wird, *so sollen doch alle Christen verwarnt sein, sich zu hüten vor solcher Abgötterei, und sollten lernen, wie man Gott recht dienen und Vergebung der Sünden durch den Glauben an Christum erlangen soll*, daß sie Gott recht ehren und beständigen Trost wider die Sünde haben können. Denn darum hat Gott gnädiglich sein Evangelium scheinen lassen, daß wir verwarnt und selig würden." (*Triglotta*, S. 418, Art. XXIV [XII], 98.)

J. T. M.

über die Lage in Rußland. Die neue antireligiöse Welle, die in den letzten Wochen eingesetzt hat, hat ihren Höhepunkt in der russischen Osterwoche erreicht. Die Sowjetpresse spricht von Verhören, Liquidationen, Untersuchungen und Arresten in Moskau, Petersburg, dem Wolgabecken, der Ukraine, dem Kaukasus, in Turkmenistan, Sibirien und Weißrußland und

nennt Orthodoxe, Protestanten, Katholiken, Baptisten, Evangeliumschristen, Adventisten und Mohammedaner. Die Berichte sind aber oft unklar, da öfters an Stelle der Namen nur die Anfangsbuchstaben der Metropoliten, Erzbischöfe und Bischöfe angegeben werden. Ihnen wird vorgeworfen „Bucharinismus", „Trotzkismus", die Organisierung nächtlicher Einbrüche, von Meuchelmord, Eisenbahnunglücken, Anschlägen gegen die Ernte, von Spionage für Deutschland, Polen und Japan, die Propaganda für Monarchismus und Faschismus und alle möglichen andern Verbrechen. — Die Kirchen waren an den Ostertagen überfüllt, zum Teil stärker noch als in den Vorjahren, trotz des antireligiösen Feldzugs und trotz der Ankündigung, daß Jeschow, das Haupt der GPU, persönlich die Leitung der Operationen gegen die konterrevolutionären Kirchenmänner übernehmen werde.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg.)

Eine halbe Million neuer „Gottloser". Der Sekretär des Zentralkomitees der kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion, Andrejeff, stellt fest, daß die Mehrheit der Mitglieder der kommunistischen Partei nicht den Gottlosenverbänden angehört. Sie müssen binnen drei Monaten dies nachholen. Die zuständigen Stellen sollen feststellen, welche kommunistischen Parteimitglieder diesen Befehl nicht ausgeführt haben. Sie sollen aus der kommunistischen Partei ausgeschlossen werden. Nach Mitteilung der sowjetrussischen Gottlosenverbände werden die bolschewistischen Gottlosen dadurch einen Zuzug von fast einer halben Million Mitglieder erhalten.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg.)

„War Christus Jude?" Ein mehrere Spalten füllender Leitaufsatz im „Stürmer" (1938, 15) beschäftigt sich erneut mit der viel erörterten Frage „War Christus Jude?" Der Schriftleiter des Blattes, Karl Holz, folgert in seinen Ausführungen über die Werte christlicher Kultur: „Eine Lehre, die nicht aus nordischem Blute kommt und nicht nordischen Geist in sich trägt, kann sich nicht unter nordischen Völkern verbreiten. Die christliche Lehre hat sich aber nicht nur unter allen nordischen Völkern verbreitet, sie hat sich auch zweitausend Jahre in diesen Völkern gehalten. Und nicht nur das: sie hat auch eine zweitausendjährige christliche Kultur geschaffen. Es entstanden die Dome und Kirchen und Münster. Es entstanden die grandiosen Kunstwerke eines Michelangelo, eines Rubens, eines Albrecht Dürer, eines Veit Stoß, eines Riemenschneider usw. Es entstanden gewaltige musikalische Werke. Es regte sich die Kunst auf allen Gebieten. Sinnlos aber wäre es, zu bestreiten, daß dies alles nicht von der christlichen Lehre und vom Christentum geweckt und ausgelöst worden wäre. Nein, wer die Wahrheit sagen will, der muß frei erklären, daß die christliche Idee zu den größten Kulturschöpferinnen der menschlichen Geschichte gehört" (im Original gesperrt. — D. Schriftl.). „Ebenso groß aber als diese Idee und ihre Auswirkungen ist auch ihr Verkünder. Christus war eine der größten und genialsten Persönlichkeiten, die je die Erde hervorgebracht hat" (Sperrung im Original). Die Zugehörigkeit zur jüdischen Rasse wird verneint.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenztg.)

Book Review — Literatur

Novum Testamentum Graece. Cum apparatu critico ex editionibus et libris manu scriptis collecta. Stuttgart, Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

Auch an dieser Stelle machen wir wieder aufmerksam auf die ausgezeichneten Ausgaben des neutestamentlichen Textes, die diese Jahrzehnte hindurch von der Privilegierten Württembergischen Bibelanstalt herausgegeben worden sind. Wohl die meisten unserer Leser haben diese Ausgaben schon viele Jahre hindurch gebraucht. Unter den neuesten Auflagen sind besonders zu nennen die 15., die auch in zehn Teilen zu haben ist, und jeder Teil eignet sich fein zur Mitnahme auf Reisen, wie z. B. die Epistel an die Römer oder die einzelnen Evangelien. Die neueste Auflage, die Rezensent eben in seiner Klassenarbeit gebraucht, nimmt Bezug auf die neuesten Funde in Ägypten und ist also völlig up to date.

P. E. Kretzmann

Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher. Übersetzt und ausgelegt von Lic. Gerhard Puttkammer. Gustav Schlößmanns Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig und Hamburg. 88 Seiten 5½×8¼. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 1.70, gebunden, RM. 2.50.

In diesem weiteren Bande der „Bibelhilfe für die Gemeinde" hat der Verfasser denselben Standpunkt innegehalten, der auch in den andern Bänden der Serie im großen und ganzen zutage tritt. Die Auslegung, die sich eng an die neue Übersetzung der Briefe anschließt, ist wirklich erbaulich und wendet das Wort Gottes auf die gegenwärtige Sachlage an. Für einen Lutheraner sind allerdings die Ausführungen zu 2 Thess. 2 kaum genügend, trotzdem der Verfasser auch erwähnt, daß man in der Reformationszeit ohne Umschweife dieses Kapitel auf den Papst und sein Reich gedeutet hat. Und so mag manchem, der eine vollständige Exegese aller Wörter und Satzteile sucht, diese oder jene Ausführung nicht genügen. Dabei bleibt aber wahr, daß die Anregung des Buches auch dem erfahrenen Exegeten von größtem Wert sein wird. Es finden sich in der Auslegung immer wieder Sätze, die auch in unsern Kreisen Berücksichtigung finden sollten. Zu 2 Thess. 3, 2 bemerkt der Verfasser schon in seiner Einführung: „Das gilt von dem Glauben, der ganzen Ernst macht mit der ganzen Wahrheit der Bibel, auch mit ihrem letzten Wort, von dem Glauben, der ‚Komm, HErr JEsu!' beten (Offenb. 22, 20) und ein festes Amen dazu sprechen kann." (S. 12.) „In seinem Missionsbericht handelt es sich also nicht um kirchliche Statistik und um die Finanzlage, sondern um den Glaubensstand." (S. 34.) Kein Bibelforscher wird dies Buch ohne Segen lesen.

P. E. Kretzmann

The Lamb, the Woman, and the Dragon. An Exposition of the Revelation of St. John. By Albertus Pieters, D. D. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 383 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, $2.00.

Although the subtitle designates this volume as an exposition of the Apocalypse, it is not a continuous exegesis of the book but rather a series of 24 chapters dealing with the important points and visions of the Revelation of St. John. Seven chapters of Dr. Pieters's exposition are devoted to introductory questions: Who Wrote the Apocalypse, and When; Other Apocalypses; God's Picture-book; The Historical Interpretation;

The Futurist Interpretation; The Principles of Interpretation; A Bird's-eye View of Revelation. The author accepts the Johannine authorship and believes the book to have been written during the last decade of the first century, under Emperor Domitian. Chapters VIII to XXIV are devoted to a fairly detailed discussion of the book, the author himself stating: "This is not a commentary in the ordinary sense of the word. It is rather a discussion of some of the outstanding problems in the book of Revelation. Verse-by-verse exposition is not attempted." (P. 5.) This part of the book contains much interesting material, which, however, is not always convincing. Apparently the author did not go into the extensive Lutheran literature on the Antichrist, his conclusions at the end of chapter XVI being, among others: "That it is highly doubtful whether the Antichrist of St. John and the Man of Sin of St. Paul are the same. . . . That the words of St. Paul do most probably refer to the coming of some great religious leader, a renegade Christian, who will be the head and front of a great apostasy in the Church, immediately before the second coming of our Lord, but contain no ground to attribute to him also political power." (P. 205.) With regard to the thousand years, the author, at the end of chapter XXII, states: "Allow me now to summarize this Preterist interpretation, which is the one I commend to the reader." Pastors who are making a special study of the Book of Revelation may consult the book with benefit, but will do well to compare many of its statements with those of good Lutheran commentaries.

P. E. KRETZMANN

The Peril of Modernizing Jesus. By Henry J. Cadbury. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1937. 216 pages, 5×7½. Price, $2.00.

The preface informs us that here there are submitted lectures which were delivered in 1935 at King's Chapel, Boston, under the auspices of the Lowell Institute. That the material was gathered to be presented in lecture form undoubtedly helps to account for the vivacious style. What the author sets out to accomplish can be deduced in part from the headings of the seven chapters: Anachronism in Thinking of Jesus; The Cause and Cure of Modernization; The Jewishness of the Gospels; Jesus and the Mentality of Our Age; Limitations of Jesus' Social Teaching; Purpose, Aim, and Motive in Jesus; The Religion of Jesus. Notes and an index enhance the usefulness of the work. The author is a thoroughgoing Modernist, and much that he says fills us with grief and has to be rejected. But he wields a two-edged sword. While he in many a sentence wounds the sensibilities of those who believe in the deity of Christ and the redemptive value of His work, he causes a good deal of havoc among the ideas which his fellow-religionists have fondled and nurtured. As the title indicates, he opposes the tendency to ascribe modern ideas which many churches of the twentieth century are proud of to Christ. He particularly annihilates the notion that Jesus taught what is now known as the social gospel. To ascribe to our Lord the sociological tenets which often are now praised as the essence of the message of Jesus he calls an anachronism. He complains there are many of them, and he is induced to speak of an experience of his own in Jerusalem. "I will admit that as a sightseer in the churches of Jerusalem I must have passed over many a glaring anachronism, until one

day, in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, I saw a real wrist watch on the arm of a statue of the Virgin. That at least was an innovation one degree too much. Anachronism there was blatant and absurd. To see a modern timepiece on a modern Arab is strange enough; how much more so with the first-century Palestinian peasant woman!" (P. 7.) In outlining how different the teaching of Jesus was from that of the modern social gospel, the author points out that Jesus rarely, if ever, dealt with social institutions as such; that He furthermore did not "know" class interests, class consciousness, class ideals; that He dealt with individuals as their own situation demanded rather than to consider the interests, privileges, rights, or duties of the other parties, and that in His teaching there is lacking the appeal to social motive. It seems to us that, if Modernists read and studied Cadbury, they would be deterred from making Jesus the champion of their sociological messages. The point of view of Dr. Cadbury, who, by the way, is Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard University, throughout the work is historical. He is not necessarily out of sympathy with the social gospel, but he does not hesitate to call it a historical error to attribute this message to Jesus. Thus, though the theology of the author is altogether subversive, he furnishes excellent historical material for the proper understanding of the teachings of Jesus.

W. ARNDT

Prophecy's Light on Today. By Charles G. Trumbull. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 191 pages, 5×7⅓. Price, $1.50.

One of the most harmful features of the chiliastic delusion is its perversion of the Christian hope. Scripture fixes the hope of the Christian on the bliss of heaven, millennialism on the mythical reign of Christ on earth during the millennium. In reading the glorious promises connected with the second coming of Christ, the consistent premillennialist can see hardly anything but the glamor of a fabled earthly reign of Christ. The book before us ("most of the chapters of which appeared as a series of articles in the *Sunday-school Times* during 1937") is a case in point. The passages Titus 2:13 ("looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ"), John 14:2, 3 ("I will come again and receive you unto Myself"), Heb. 9:28 ("Christ shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation"), Job 19:25-27; Eph. 1:15-23; Phil. 2:10, 11; 3:20, 21; 2 Tim. 4:8, etc., etc., are unhesitatingly and persistently applied to a coming of Christ for the inauguration of a millennial reign on earth. "So many Christian people are rejoicing today in 'that blessed hope' of the Lord's personal, visible, bodily return to establish His kingdom on earth and bring in the millennium of His personal reign" (p. 36). "'That blessed hope' of the believers, waiting for the Lord's return, when He will establish His kingdom on earth. . . . Eden conditions will be restored; wars will cease. . . . The throne of David is still empty; but it shall be occupied, here on earth, by David's greater Son. . . . From Armageddon the King will move on in triumph until He establishes again the throne of David and reigns over the whole earth" (pp. 26, 32, 160). "1 Cor. 13:13 tells us of three precious things that abide: faith, hope, love. 'Faith believes that the Bible is the whole Word of God,' believes it 'from cover to cover';

and that is Fundamentalism. 'Hope' is the blessed hope of the Lord's return, or premillennialism. So we may read: 'And now abideth fundamentalism, premillennialism, love, these three'" (p. 155). Dr. Trumbull has no intention, of course, of denying or even minimizing the bliss of heaven, but under the spell of the chiliastic delusion he cannot find time to stress it. He mentions it twice, perhaps three times. On page 58 we find the bare statement: "'They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more.' And why? 'For the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne shall be their Shepherd and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life; and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes,' Rev. 7:17 (R. V.)." And on page 69 heaven is barely alluded to: "The second coming of Christ, being His personal, visible, bodily return to establish His kingdom on earth and to reign over Israel and the world for a thousand years, after which will come 'a new heaven and a new earth,' Rev. 21:1, is the goal, climax, and consummation of Bible prophecy." Heaven is barely mentioned; all the glorious passages quoted above and all the rest "are plain predictions of a glorious future for God's chosen people here on earth, of the earthly millennium, or Golden Age, which, the Scriptures tell us, can come only when Christ comes again" (p. 31). And the introduction by Dr. Howard A. Kelly contains this paragraph: "Is it not a great, obvious, important truth that we cannot grow into a living apprehension of more advanced truths until we have fully apprehended the antecedent underlying basic truths? First, the virgin birth of the Son of God — Son of Man; then His sacrificial life and crucifixion; then His resurrection and ascension; to be followed by His glorious return, to reign with His saints, to the world where He was so dishonored." There it stops. The basic article of eternal life — which Dr. Kelly, of course, accepts — is not mentioned.

We are in agreement with much of what is said in this book, a fundamentalist writing. Much, too, of what is said concerning the signs of Christ's second coming — one of these signs being the emergence and spread of Modernism — is Scriptural and timely. But parts of this section and the tenor of the entire book are unscriptural. Scripture tells us, and we must tell the world and the Church, that Christ is coming again, personally, visibly, etc. The premillennialists are doing that. But while Scripture tells us that Christ, at His second coming, will at once judge the unbeliever and take the believer with Him to heaven, the consistent premillennialist is fixing the hope of the Christian on a chimera.

TH. ENGELDER

What Is Lutheranism? By Wm. Dallmann, D. D. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis. 38 pages, 4½×7. Price, 10 cts.; in quantities, 8 cts., plus postage. Order from Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

To Dr. Dallmann, God indeed has given a long and blessed writing ministry, the present tract being the 53d among the titles listed for advertisement, and among these are very large volumes, such as *Jesus* (third edition), *Paul, Peter, John,* etc. In the brochure before us Dr. Dallmann shows the Christian character of Lutheranism, and he does this by adducing testimonies from non-Lutheran sources. The topics

around which the subject-material is centered are: The Gospel, Faith, the Church, Justification and Election, and the Holy Communion. All these fundamental doctrines of Lutheranism, as the non-Lutheran witnesses attest, are truly Scriptural. Here, then, is a tract of great value, which ought not only to be spread among non-Lutherans, but also to be carefully studied in Christian day-schools, Sunday-schools, catechumen classes, Bible societies, etc., since it sets forth distinctive Lutheran doctrines, and these as witnessed in their Biblicality by scholars of international prominence outside the pale of the Lutheran Church. For the sake of the common people a glossary of proper nouns and theological terms might be added (Duns Scotus, Peter d'Ailly, Calvin, Transubstantiation, Lateran Council, etc.). On page 20 the *alii, alii non* might be explained more fully and the general expository truth be added that those who are saved are saved solely by grace, while those who are damned are lost through their own fault. The difficulty of the *alii prae aliis* arises only if we compare "one with another." We wish that Baptism, so much in controversy today, could have been added to the subjects treated in this brochure, which ought to receive special publicity in our papers in this centennial year when Lutheranism will be brought to the notice of millions by the mere fact of our ocean-to-ocean celebration. J. Theodore Mueller

Who Is the Holy Spirit? A Study of the Word of God Concerning His Person, Office, and Work. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 124 pages, 5¼×7¼. Price, $1.25.

In the Foreword the author writes: "The Holy Spirit is the neglected, if not the almost forgotten, Person of the Holy Trinity, and the obligation is upon all of us to make Him known." This he attempts to do by presenting in so many chapters the Holy Spirit's Personality, Office, Sovereignty, Limiting (He does all things in due time and order), Baptism (he discusses this mooted subject with much sanity), Filling, Sanctifying, Empowering, Objectives. A graduate of Princeton Seminary, in its prime, Dr. Frost everywhere shows himself a thorough, painstaking, scholarly theologian, and his firm fundamentalistic attitude makes his book a joy to every Christian believer. For many years he was connected with the China Inland Mission, and (a voluminous writer) especially his "Meditations on Important Truths," *About the Old Faith*, published years ago, won for him many friends in America and Great Britain. Although his presentations are not always in accord with our Lutheran Confessions (denial of private confession and absolution; millennialism, Calvinism), his monograph makes interesting and instructive reading also for Lutheran ministers, especially since he invariably goes back to the Bible to support his declarations. There is a winsome spirit of deep spiritual devotion running through the entire treatise. J. Theodore Mueller

Reconciliation and Justification. By Rev. Theo. Dierks, S. T. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 173 pages, 6×9. Price, 90 cts.

This is a thorough and instructive study of the doctrine of reconciliation and justification as taught in Scripture and the early Christian Church. Originally a doctor's thesis, it is now offered for larger use and wider dissemination in book form. First the author presents the doctrine

as taught by Christ and the apostles and then as it was confessed in the Christian Church, in the first century after the apostles, by such men as Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin and Irenaeus, and in such writings as the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Didache*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Second Epistle of Clement*, and the *Epistle to Diognetus*. His "finds" he presents in the "Conclusion," in which he points out that most of the Church Fathers did not hold fast to the objective reconciliation and justification as an accomplished fact, so that in the course of time also the doctrine of subjective justification became easily corrupted by the infusion of work elements. A very fine bibliography is added for reference, while a very helpful synoptic index will aid the reader in quickly orienting himself in case of reference requirements. We heartily recommend this learned but limpid treatise to our pastors. Hasn't the doctrine here presented become a sort of *doctrina incognita* also to some of us?

J. Theodore Mueller

Reaching Upward, or Man's Age-Long Search for Truth. By C. D. Whiteley. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 182 pages, 5×7½. Price, $1.50.

This book is directed against the theory "that religion has been a gradual development and that it came up through animism and polytheism." The author, a Presbyterian minister in Albemarle, N. C., surveys the leading pagan religions and shows that in man's search for God there is no trace of a gradual development, but rather that in all pagan and naturalistic religions there has been a marked and gradual degradation. Dr. Whiteley includes a chapter on Modernism, which is the most recent effort "to find God apart from supernatural revelation" (p. 97) and is nothing more than "the naturalism of all past ages dressed in present-day finery" (p. 96). The two concluding chapters deal with God's revelation to man in the Old and the New Testament. The book was not written for scholars. The author's interest is that of the pastor who wants to safeguard the youth of the Church against the vagaries of the pseudo-anthropologists, who in the name of psychology, philosophy, or history deny supernatural revelation. The author's style and his approach to the problem, which is distinctly Fundamental, prompt us to recommend this book. It should prove helpful to those of our laity who have been disturbed by the theories of naturalism.

F. E. Mayer

Der Gottesgedanke in der Welt. Von Paul Rohrbach. Hans-Bott-Verlag, Berlin-Tempelhof. 263 Seiten 5½×7¼.

Der Verfasser ist ein bekannter Schriftsteller Deutschlands, hatte eine theologische Ausbildung genossen, hat dann aber, wie er im Vorwort schreibt, „dem theologischen Lehramt vor bald vier Jahrzehnten entsagt, weil mir vorweg verwehrt wurde, gegen den Bekenntniszwang zu wirken. So wandte ich mich zur Arbeit für den deutschen Gedanken in der Welt; aber ich habe nie aufgehört, die christliche Religion für eine Hauptwurzel gesunden völkischen Denkens zu halten". In Wahrheit bekämpft er die christliche Religion, bekämpft die Verbalinspiration, die mosaische Autorschaft des Pentateuchs, nennt die Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments „Erzeugnisse zeitlich und inhaltlich voneinander verschiedener religiöser Vorstellungswelten". (S. 208.) Man wird Christ „nicht kraft des Glaubens, durch Christi ‚Werk' objektiv ‚erlöst' zu sein, sondern Auge in Auge mit Jesus, der uns

fragt: ‚Willſt du ewiges oder irdiſches Leben? Willſt du Liebe oder Selbſtſucht zur Wurzel deiner Geſinnung machen? Willſt du Gott dienen oder deinen Trieben?“ (S. 246.) Sehr intereſſant und lehrreich iſt das Kapitel über germaniſche Religion, während ſeine Ausführungen über das Chriſtentum und die Germanen natürlich von ſeiner verkehrten Auffaſſung des Chriſtentums aus geſchrieben ſind und er daher kein korrektes Bild dieſes Verhältniſſes entwerfen kann.

Th. Lätſch

Communion and Confessional Sermons. By Harold L. Yochum. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 112 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price. $1.00.

Within these 112 pages an experienced, well-trained preacher may find some thoughts which may be utilized in a confessional address. But it is not the book to serve a young, inexperienced pastor as a model, and these latter are the very ones who need assistance. In the very first address the author uses this comparison, "Like a condemned criminal, who has but a few hours left before his death, Jesus treasured the precious moments of fellowship with those who were dear to Him." We doubt the good taste of such a comparison. He speaks of "hostile visages" (p. 6), of "surcease" (p. 6), of a "segment of faith" (p. 11), of "presaged" (p. 22). In this same first address he writes: "And for some of you the desire to come to this Holy Communion is occasioned by a sense of sorrow. Sorrow over the death of some dear relative or friend, the same sorrow of loneliness and separation which saddened the heart of Jesus, dims your eyes with tears as you come to the Lord's Table. You rightly sense the mystic fellowship with those who have gone before, and those who share like sorrows here on earth, which is offered you in this Holy Communion." At the close of the second sermon he bases his argument upon his definition of Communism and Fascism. We doubt the advisability of introducing these subjects in a confessional address. Nor are these two isms so simple that a line or two will serve to define them. The Jews are criticized for using a leg of lamb only in their present Passover ceremonies. Nor are we in sympathy with what is said about the Lord Jesus at the Passover table occupying the place of the "Coming One," which the Jews are said to leave empty at every Passover feast. True, Pastor Yochum insists that there are in the Lord's Supper more than symbols; but even so the following sentence is unfortunate: "that solid bread and that red-flowing wine are suited to symbolize our Savior's body and blood given and shed for us." In the fifth address the "order of the Holy Communion" is discussed. This is a liturgical dissertation which may be used at other times, but not in a confessional address. On p. 75 he calls attention to the great change which came over the publican who had visited the Temple and prayed, "God be merciful to me, a sinner," and then he addresses these words to his congregation: "Have you ever experienced such a transformation here in the house of God, here at the Lord's Table? . . . Something is wrong with you if you have not." We are convinced that there are still many in our congregations who have never lost their baptismal grace.

In spite of all that has been said, the book contains material which may be utilized by one who works with trained selective discretion.

M. S. Sommer

Proceedings of the Twentieth Convention of the Central Illinois District of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. 60 pages, 6×9. Order from the Rev. E. Wuehle, R. 1, East Moline, Ill. Price, 20 cts.

Twentieth Convention of the Northern Illinois District. 71 pages, 6×9.

The *Proceedings of the Central Illinois District* convention offer, besides the usual committee and board reports, the newly adopted regulations governing District finances, the Indigent Students' Board, the Board of Support, the Press Committee, the Committee on Congregational Constitutions, for the Officers' Conference, and the District Custodian-Historian, and a very timely and instructive doctrinal essay on "The Christian Home" by Prof. M. H. Coyner. This is the continuation of the essay read at the 1936 convention. It stresses the need of special efforts for its establishment and maintenance on the part of the home and congregation. Our pastors ought to procure a copy of this essay and use the material offered in their sermons or talks to the various societies and in the congregational meetings. Pastor Wuehle informs us that copies of the *Proceedings* of 1936 may still be obtained from him and that the price of the two reports is 35 cents.

The *Proceedings of the Northern Illinois District* convention offer a German essay on the reasons urging a Christian to receive the Sacrament frequently, by Prof. Ed. Koehler, and another in the English langue by Rev. A. H. Lange on the need of upholding in doctrine and in practise the truth that the local congregation is the only society instituted by God within the Church. The pastoral sermon on Luke 7:24-30 by the recently deceased Pastor R. Piehler presents John the Baptist as an example for all pastors.

THEO. LAETSCH

BOOKS RECEIVED

From the Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago:

A Self Worth Having. By W. G. Chanter. 116 pages, 5×7½. Price, $1.25.

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

My Human Best. Spring quarter of the "Quiet Hour Series." By Richard Ellsworth Day. 185 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, 35 cts.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "July 38" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.